

JAN 27

The Department of State

bulletin

V. XXXII, No. 811

January 10, 1955



BALANCING THE BOOKS FOR 1954 • Statement by Secretary Dulles 43

THE AMERICAN FARMER AND FOREIGN TRADE • by Ben H. Thibodeaux 45

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AS A WEAPON FOR PEACE • Statement by A. M. Ade Johnson 58

PRESERVATION OF INTERNATIONAL METRIC STANDARDS • Article by E. C. Crittenden 54

For index see inside back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXXII, No. 811 • PUBLICATION 5722

January 10, 1955

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:

52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Balancing the Books for 1954

News Conference Statement by Secretary Dulles

Press release 741 dated December 31

As we close the books for 1954, we can feel a measure of satisfaction. The year has had its disappointments and reverses. However, on net balance, there has been substantial gain. Most of all this gain has been in the demonstrated capacity of the free nations to develop, cooperatively, their unity and strength. As a result, the danger of general war recedes.

One setback has been the Indochina armistice, which reflected the military reverses of the French Union. But out of this setback there has come the Manila Pact, which, if adequately implemented, can limit the scope and consequences of the loss.

Another setback was the defeat in France of the European Defense Community. But out of that has come the plan for Western European Union which reproduces much of the good contained in the EDC. This new plan has now been approved by the French Assembly in the face of unparalleled pressure from the Soviet Communist bloc.

Thus, when there has been adversity, the free world has shown a capacity to react to it. In addition, the free nations have solved, or are in a good way to solve, many highly controversial issues which threatened their unity. Among these matters may be mentioned the dispute between Italy and Yugoslavia about Trieste, the dispute between Britain and Egypt about the Suez Base, the oil dispute between Britain and Iran, and the dispute between France and Germany about the Saar.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has adopted major decisions which, when implemented, will give it vastly increased defensive power.

In this hemisphere, the American States, through the Caracas declaration, have made a momentous announcement with reference to inter-

national communism. This, as I have said, may serve the needs of our time as the Monroe Doctrine served the needs of the last century.

Vote by French Assembly on London and Paris Accords

Statement by Secretary Dulles

Press release 737 dated December 30

The news from France is good. The French Assembly voted to ratify the treaties which will carry into effect the accords reached last October in London and Paris.¹ The vote indicates that of all the parties only the Communist bloc of about 100 deputies voted mechanically against all constructive measures. In the other parties there were differences, but they were differences of opinion as to how best to proceed to achieve Western European unity under conditions which would assure increased strength to protect national and individual freedom. It is understandable that these differences should have existed. The issues were both complicated and momentous. Now that the French Assembly has spoken, we can justifiably hope that the remaining ratification procedures in France and elsewhere will soon be concluded.

A special tribute is due to those in France who saw that patriotism required the burying of age-old hostilities. That this could happen is a good augury for the years ahead.

¹For texts of the Final Act of the London Conference and of the agreements signed at Paris, see BULLETIN of Oct. 11, 1954, p. 515, and Nov. 15, 1954, p. 719.

In Iran and in Guatemala, Communist positions of strength have been vigorously erased.

In the Middle East, the northern tier concept is taking form under the leadership of Turkey and Pakistan.

From a military standpoint the free nations continue strong and have found the way to maintain and develop their strength consistently with their economic well-being. What we call the "long haul" concept has been brought into application both in this country and in others which had been operating on emergency plans.

In the Western Pacific, the security base has been rounded out by the U.S. treaty with the Republic of Korea and by the pending treaty with the Republic of China, as well as by the Manila Pact.

Our relations with our allies are intimate and marked by mutual confidence born out of President Eisenhower's "good partner" concept.

The United Nations has this year shown increased vigor, and we have joined in entrusting to it the task of obtaining the release of U.S. prisoners of war wrongfully imprisoned by Communist China in violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement.

Under the auspices of the United Nations, there is rapidly taking form the Eisenhower plan for using atomic energy to enrich and uplift all humanity.

All of this enables us to face the new year with confidence. But we must beware of overconfidence. Hostile forces remain strong and implacable and they are operating with even greater guile than heretofore. In the face of that undiminished power and guile we cannot expect an unbroken series of successes. Indeed, we cannot hold our own, much less increase our net gain, unless we maintain our vigilance and our efforts on a basis of national unity.

Peace will never be won if men reserve for war their greatest efforts. Peace, too, requires well-directed and sustained sacrificial endeavor. Given that, we can, I believe, achieve the great goal of our foreign policy, that of enabling our people to enjoy in peace the blessings of liberty.

U.S. and U.K. Discuss Extension of Proving Ground for Guided Missiles

Press release 733 dated December 30

In 1950 an agreement was signed between the Government of the United Kingdom, with the concurrence of the Government of the Bahamas, and the Government of the United States, to provide for the establishment in the Bahamas of a long-range proving ground for guided missiles.¹ The range has subsequently been operated in close and successful cooperation between these Governments.

The test range presently extends from Cape Canaveral southeast, through the Bahamas archipelago, with tracking stations on the islands of Grand Bahama, Eleuthera, San Salvador, Mayaguana, Grand Turk of the Turks and Caicos Islands, Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico. These bases have all been constructed, except the latter two, which are under construction.

The Air Force Missile Test Center, which operates the Florida Missile Test Range, is located at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, and is one of the 10 centers of the Air Research and Development Command. The range is used to test guided missiles and pilotless aircraft for governmental agencies and contractors.

Negotiations are now in progress to extend this range to the British territories of Saint Lucia in the Windward Islands and Ascension Island in the South Atlantic. In these negotiations, which it is hoped will play a valuable part in strengthening Western defense, effective steps will be taken to safeguard the interests and safety of the inhabitants of the territories concerned and of civilian shipping and air commerce.

¹ BULLETIN of July 31, 1950, p. 191.

The American Farmer and Foreign Trade

by Ben H. Thibodeaux

Director of the Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy¹

It is a privilege for me to discuss with you a subject in which all of us in the United States have such a big stake. My subject is the foreign trade of the United States and the decisions that need to be made as to the course and magnitude of that trade.

It is a particular pleasure to discuss that topic at the annual meeting of the Farm Bureau Federation. The leadership of the Federation, with that of our other great farm organizations, has been in the forefront in support of United States foreign economic policies and operations that not only have benefited American agriculture and our economy generally but also have served to strengthen our relations with other countries in the free world. To cite one example, I gratefully recall how Allen Kline, James Patton, J. T. Sanders, and John Davis, each representing his own organization, visited Europe as a team in 1950 at our invitation to appraise the food and agricultural program being conducted under the Marshall plan. Their participation in and support of that work contributed greatly to its success.

Indeed, much of what I have to say today on our foreign trade is in keeping with the policies of the Farm Bureau as stated in various forums by your president, Mr. Kline, and as outlined in your resolutions in the past. The support of trade expansion by American farm groups is based upon their solid realization of its crucial importance to the United States.

Significance of Foreign Trade

The significance of foreign trade to the United States cannot be judged from the coverall figure

¹ Address made before the American Farm Bureau Federation, New York, N. Y., on Dec. 13.

that only about 4 percent of our national income is derived from exports. The percentage figure reflects the tremendous size of our total economy rather than the significance of our foreign trade either to ourselves or to the rest of the world.

Actually the United States is the largest exporter in the world—and the largest importer as well. A number of countries are dependent upon us as their largest single source of supplies and their largest single market. This means that their economic welfare is highly dependent upon the demand for their products in the United States and the terms upon which their products may enter our markets. Our actions in the foreign trade field thus have a tremendous effect on the economies of these countries and determine to an important extent the level of living that their people can afford.

The percentage of our total national income derived from exports also hides the high dependence of many important sectors of our economy upon exports. Foremost among these is agriculture. In recent years we have exported approximately 27 percent of our cotton, 30 percent of our wheat, 53 percent of our rice, and 24 percent of our tobacco. More than one-fifth of each of a number of agricultural products finds its way into export outlets. An estimated 55 million acres of farm land were used in the production of commodities for export in 1951.

On the industrial side, likewise, one-fifth or more of various types of machinery is exported; included are steel-mill equipment, tractors, combines, and textile machinery. More than 15 percent of our lubricating oils, motor trucks, insecticides, and printing equipment are exported.

A sharp decline in our exports affects not only the industries directly concerned. It may also produce a chain reaction that penetrates deeply

and dangerously into our economy. A sharp drop in cotton exports that results in reduced farm incomes is immediately felt by sellers of automobiles, refrigerators, farm machinery, and fertilizers in the South. Similarly, a cutback in industrial exports and consequent material unemployment in export industries becomes reflected in a reduced demand for farm products. We frequently hear the argument that imports may cause unemployment. We should not forget the other side of the coin, and that is, a fall in exports also results in unemployment and idle resources.

I repeat, then, that we have a high stake in the foreign trade of the United States. It is one of the essential elements in the economic welfare of ourselves and of the free world.

There are many facets of our foreign trade that invite discussion. I should like to deal with two of them. One is the so-called dollar problem and the questions relating to it. The other is the work that we are doing with other countries in a cooperative effort to expand world trade for the benefit of all.

The Dollar Problem

Let us examine briefly the nature and significance of the so-called dollar problem.

Our domestic producer expects to be paid in dollars for his products, including the part that may be exported. The foreigner who might need these products frequently has been unable to obtain the dollars required for their purchase. In these conditions, there is no sale. If these circumstances are multiplied by a few million producers in the United States and millions of would-be consumers abroad, the result is mounting domestic surpluses and the problem of what to do about them. Unfortunately we have encountered these conditions much too frequently.

The dollar shortage abroad has been greatly eased in the last 2 years. A balance of payments was achieved between the United States and the rest of the world both in 1953 and 1954. Gold reserves and dollar holdings of foreign countries (excluding the U. S. S. R.) amounted to \$27.4 billion at mid-1954—an increase of nearly \$5 billion compared with 2 years earlier. These conditions have enabled the rest of the world to buy more of our products. An increase in our exports this spring and early summer was one of the factors

that checked the decline in United States production.

The ability of foreign countries to buy from us must be sustained and increased. The progress that has been made must be safeguarded and improved. We are entering a competitive era in world trade. Unless the countries of the world can earn sufficient dollars to buy our products, however, we shall be in a poor position to compete. We would again have the dollar problem in full force.

The reason for dollar shortages abroad is simply stated. We have been exporting much more than we have imported, and we have been heavily surplus in our balance of payments with the rest of the world. The phenomenon is not new. It arose in serious proportions following World War I, when we emerged as a creditor nation and with a continuing net surplus in our accounts with other countries. These conditions persisted through the 1930's and became particularly acute immediately following World War II.

For foreign countries dollar scarcities frequently have meant economic distress because of inability to obtain sufficient food, raw materials, machinery, fuel, or other items essential for economic activity and the maintenance of living standards at reasonable levels. Particularly was this true in the immediate postwar period. Economic distress in turn has frequently engendered public unrest, political instability, and a sense of resentment that dire war¹ should prevail in some countries simultaneously with the existence of burdensome surpluses in others. Economic weakness has also impaired the ability of countries to combat communism and to prepare their defenses against aggression. These circumstances have served to set the stage for Communist exploitation and the propaganda reiteration of the hackneyed Marxian theme, now about 100 years old, that the capitalistic system is on the verge of falling apart.

Dollar shortages abroad have directly threatened our own economy. Because of limited ability to buy from us, foreign countries have severely restricted their imports of American goods by means of quotas, embargoes, and exchange restrictions. They did without our goods when they could. Nondollar supplies were sought even at relatively high prices in the currencies available to the importing country. A pronounced trend developed toward national self-sufficiency,

prompted in part by fears of war and by protectionism, but also because of limited foreign exchange. I need not elaborate to this group that a continuation of these practices would permanently impair our export markets, to the detriment of our domestic producers.

The dollar problem assumed crisis proportions following World War II, when the vast demands for food and reconstruction material had to be supplied largely from the United States. The gold and dollar reserves of the war-ravaged countries were near exhaustion, and the means of earning dollars to pay for needed supplies were inadequate or nonexistent. Had we hesitated, economic and hence political chaos might have resulted and the Kremlin might have absorbed more of Europe than it now has under its phony pigeon wing.

The United States met the challenge, through the Marshall plan and in other ways, with grants and loans that amounted to \$32 billion during the period 1946-53. An additional \$10 billion was supplied during that period in the form of grants of military supplies and services. The results of that aid are well known. Production and trade levels in the Marshall plan countries are now materially higher than prewar, and Western Europe is solidly entrenched in a system of economic strength, freedom, and democracy that it is prepared to defend. Progress is being made in other parts of the world, although conditions still exist, particularly in underdeveloped areas, that may require special attention.

As I indicated earlier, the rest of the world was approximately in balance of payments with the United States in each of the last 2 years, and foreign holdings of gold and dollars have increased to comfortable levels. The position admittedly is not stable as yet. The balance in our current accounts with other countries is partly explained by continued restrictions on dollar imports, and increased dollar reserves abroad have been made possible largely by huge United States expenditures for foreign economic aid and military support. These are important qualifications. Nonetheless, given the improvement that has occurred and the consequent reduction in our foreign aid, the time has come for a decision in the United States as to the future course of our foreign trade policy and business relations with the rest of the world.

Possible Alternatives

In making a decision as to our trade policy, three alternatives present themselves:

1. Continue to supply dollars through our economic aid programs to enable the rest of the world to buy more commodities from us, or simply give the commodities away;
2. Curtail our production to domestic needs and an effective foreign demand within circumscribed limits;
3. Aggressively seek to expand international trade on a mutually profitable and equitable basis, thereby enabling other countries to earn more dollars to spend in our markets and to meet payments on American investments needed for their economic development.

The first two alternatives may have to be used to some degree in coping with emergency situations. I think you will agree, however, that they do not represent desirable long-term solutions either for us or for the other nations of the free world. The first alternative imposes a staggering burden on the American taxpayer and would be resisted by foreign countries desirous of employing their labor and resources to earn dollars by trade instead of having to solicit gifts or loans. Under the second alternative, even assuming that the necessary adjustments might be made without excessive cost and decreased domestic levels of living, our allies would be deprived of goods that they need. This would weaken their economies and their ties with us and push them toward the Soviet bloc in search of trade.

By all measures, including our domestic welfare as well as the strengthening of our foreign economic and security relations, the third alternative—that of expanding international trade to the highest possible level—is the soundest solution consistent with the best long-term interests of the United States. It is the commonsense course which gives recognition to the simple fact that, if we wish to sell abroad, we must also buy abroad. It is the course that enables the fullest and most efficient use of our resources and those of the other free countries. By contributing to mutually beneficial exchanges of goods, services, and investments, it also provides a solid support for our political relations with friendly countries and for their effective participation in the common defense against Communist encroachments.

Expansion of World Trade

I should like now to discuss work that is in progress in keeping with the objective of expanding world trade. I shall address myself specifically to the measures being taken for the removal of trade restrictions.

The President is authorized to negotiate tariffs with other countries under the terms of the Trade Agreements Act. This act is due to expire on June 12, 1955. Failure to obtain its renewal in Congress would mean that tariff negotiations with other countries as at present would come to an end. The President proposes, however, to request congressional action on this legislation, as indicated in his letter of November 8, 1954, to Assistant Secretary of State Waugh, which reads in part as follows:²

Based upon . . . a review in the United States, I recommended in March of this year a program for expanding international trade and overseas investment, for promoting currency convertibility, and for reducing the need for economic aid. Some portions of this program have already been put into effect. The remaining parts, especially the heart of the program—extension and amendment of our Trade Agreements Act—will, as you know, be pressed at the session of the Congress which begins in January, and I look forward to early action.

That program envisages United States participation in a multilateral approach to tariffs and trade. The General Agreement [on Tariffs and Trade] has made a useful contribution to the postwar recovery and restoration of the economic vitality of the free world.

Under the Trade Agreements Act, bilateral agreements were negotiated with 29 countries from 1934 onward. These agreements were highly useful in helping cure the paralysis in world trade resulting from the depression of the early 1930's. Bilateral trade arrangements, however, are cumbersome and have the obvious disadvantage of defining trade channels too narrowly.

Beginning in 1947 the United States joined with 33 other countries in multilateral tariff and related negotiations under a set of rules called the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). These countries account for about 80 percent of world trade. The GATT is deservedly given credit for a substantial reduction in barriers to international trade and for a period of stability in tariffs unprecedented since before World War I.

Negotiations with the other countries in the

GATT are now in progress at Geneva,³ for the purpose of (a) clarifying and strengthening the rules of good behavior in international trade among the GATT partners and (b) obtaining agreement on a constitution for an effective organization to administer the GATT. It is planned to submit this organization constitution to the Congress for approval. The delegation representing the United States in these negotiations at Geneva comprises not only Government officials but also a bipartisan congressional group and public members.

The trading rules of the GATT, formulated in 1947, were highly flavored by the difficult economic conditions of the immediate postwar period. These conditions, fortunately, are vastly ameliorated, as I explained earlier, and there is need now to modify the GATT rules accordingly.

Restrictions on American Exports

There are a number of improvements that we seek in the trading rules of the GATT. Foremost among these are stricter rules against the imposition of restrictions against imports of American commodities. Many foreign countries continue to discriminate against American imports for financial reasons. The dollar problem continues to plague us, as it has in the past. Import quotas and exchange restrictions against dollar imports are still widespread. We are pressing for the elimination of these restrictions, however, by countries that have accumulated reasonably adequate reserves of gold and dollars in relation to their current imports from the dollar area. Considerable progress has been made. Greece is now entirely free of such restrictions. Important relaxations have been made by Germany, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Benelux, Switzerland, Italy, and others. It is our view that faster progress can be made, however, and we are pushing for it.

Our efforts are meeting with strong resistance from other countries. The resistance stems from a fear that protectionism and import restrictions in the United States will make it difficult for other countries to continue to earn dollars by trade. They fear that an overly rapid removal of restric-

² For an announcement of the U.S. delegation, see *ibid.*, Nov. 8, 1954, p. 711; for a statement at Geneva on Nov. 10 by Assistant Secretary Waugh, chairman of the U.S. delegation, see *ibid.*, Nov. 22, 1954, p. 772.

³ BULLETIN of Nov. 22, 1954, p. 774.

tions against dollar imports would deplete reserves that have been built up largely by self-denial of imports. The attitude is to play safe and to maintain "rainy day" reserves until there is positive indication that the United States is ready and willing to let down its own barriers against imports and thereby enable other countries to earn dollars which in turn could be spent more freely in our markets.

Whether we like it or not—and we do not—there is distrust abroad as to our commercial policy intentions. A major objective in our aid operations abroad has been to induce foreigners to increase their productivity, to adapt their products to the American market, and to earn their own dollars in order to relieve the American taxpayer of the aid burden. A number of countries have done precisely that. Still officials and businessmen from these countries report that they become confused and frustrated when their efforts to earn dollars are made difficult or impossible by our import restrictions, including:

1. The Buy American Act. The rejection of foreign bids much below the lowest domestic bid has created high concern abroad, particularly when similar items are not permitted to be shipped to the Soviet bloc for security reasons;

2. An invocation of the escape clause of our Tariff Act and the imposition of import quotas or increased tariff fees at the first sign of foreign competition in a country that prides itself on its freely competitive system;

3. Tariffs which in many cases are considered prohibitive; and

4. Customs procedures that are frequently so complex, uncertain, and time-consuming as to discourage even the hardest potential seller in the American market.

In seeking the elimination by other countries of their restrictions against American exports, we sometimes find ourselves in the weak bargaining position of having to insist that our own import restrictions must be maintained. Under section 22 of our Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, for example, the importation of an agricultural commodity may be reduced to 50 percent of imports during a past period, and duties may be levied up to 50 percent of the unit value of the commodity if its importation injures or threatens to interfere with a domestic agricultural program.

It is recognized in other countries that the American taxpayer should not be asked to subsidize imports of commodities attracted by our high support prices. There is also appreciation abroad that our cutbacks of imports under section 22 have been moderate. Foreign suppliers are afraid, however, that our future actions *could* be less moderate. These fears would be dispelled if it were possible for us to agree that our restrictions under section 22 would not be below the volume of imports that would have occurred in the absence of a domestic support program.

There is also deep concern abroad lest our agricultural surplus disposals and export subsidies disrupt world prices and pre-empt markets normally supplied in part by other countries. The foreign producer realizes full well that he is unable to compete with the United States Treasury. Here too, however, there is appreciation of the moderation with which these programs have been administered. Continued consultation with friendly countries likely to be affected by our actions would dispel the uncertainty as to our intentions. So would our adherence to a policy that our subsidies on export commodities should not be at such a level as to pre-empt more than our equitable share of the world market.

Trade restrictive measures are not unique with the United States, as I indicated earlier. Various countries employ a formidable array of restrictive devices against our exports. Many are purely protectionist. But no one country is willing to relax these measures or to lower its tariffs unless its trading partners also agree to take such measures. That is the challenge and the opportunity in the multilateral negotiations under the GATT and in our trade relations with the free world generally.

The United States must accept the challenge. In international trade the United States simply cannot "go it alone." In its own best interests it must exercise its leadership in pushing for effective international cooperation toward the goal of trade expansion. For, as President Eisenhower said in his message of March 30, 1954, to the Congress,⁴

If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all. Our domestic employment, our standard of living, our security, and the solidarity of the free world—all are involved.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Apr. 19, 1954, p. 602.

Procedures for Administering Buy American Act

White House press release dated December 17

The President on December 17 issued an Executive order establishing uniform standards and procedures to be applied in administering the Buy American Act. The order is designed to bring about the greatest possible uniformity among executive agencies applying the basic legislation. The Buy American Act, which became law in 1933, provides that preference in the award of government contracts shall be given to domestic suppliers, as against foreign suppliers, unless the domestic supplier's bid or offered price is unreasonable or the award to him would be inconsistent with the public interest.

Two methods are provided in the order for determining whether the domestic supplier's bid or offered price is unreasonable. The head of each agency will select the method better suited to the procurement procedures of his agency. Under the first method the bid or offered price of a domestic supplier will be deemed unreasonable if it is greater than 106 percent of the bid or offered price of the foreign bidder (including applicable duty and costs incurred after arrival in the United States).

Under the alternative method the domestic price will be deemed unreasonable if it exceeds the sum of (1) the foreign bid or offered price (including applicable duty and costs incurred after arrival in the United States) and (2) 10 percent of such bid exclusive of such duty and costs. When the price amounts to less than \$25,000, in the interests of administrative simplicity only the applicable duty need be excluded from the bid or offered price in making a determination under this second method.

The order provides exceptions permitting agency heads to retain their authority or responsibility to place a fair proportion of their total purchases with small business concerns, and to reject any bid or offer for security reasons or because it would be in the national interest to do so.

The order also permits rejection of a foreign bid or offer in any situation in which the domestic low bidder would produce substantially all of the materials in areas of substantial unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor after a determination by the President that such preference would be in the national interest. In issuing the

Executive order the President announced that he had made a determination that it is at this time in the national interest to give a preference to United States low bidders who will produce substantially all of the materials contracted for in labor-surplus areas.

Wherever the head of an executive agency proposing to purchase domestic materials determines that a greater differential than that provided in the order is not unreasonable or is not inconsistent with the public interest, he is authorized to do so by the order and thereafter to submit a written report of the facts in the case to the President.

Executive Order 10582¹

PRESCRIBING UNIFORM PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS UNDER THE BUY-AMERICAN ACT

WHEREAS in the administration of the act of March 3, 1933, 47 Stat. 1520, 41 U. S. C. 10a-10c; 41 U. S. C. 10d, commonly known as the Buy-American Act, and other laws requiring the application of the Buy-American Act, the heads of executive agencies are required to determine, as a condition precedent to the purchase by their agencies of materials of foreign origin for public use within the United States, (a) that the price of like materials of domestic origin is unreasonable, or (b) that the purchase of like materials of domestic origin is inconsistent with the public interest; and

WHEREAS it is desirable and in the public interest that such determinations be made on as uniform a basis as possible:

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. As used in this order, (a) the term "materials" includes articles and supplies, (b) the term "executive agency" includes executive department, independent establishment, and other instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, and (c) the term "bid or offered price of materials of foreign origin" means the bid or offered price of such materials delivered at the place specified in the invitation to bid including applicable duty and all costs incurred after arrival in the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this order materials shall be considered to be of foreign origin if the cost of the foreign products used in such materials constitutes fifty per centum or more of the cost of all the products used in such materials.

(b) For the purposes of the said act of March 3, 1933, and the other laws referred to in the first paragraph of the preamble of this order, the bid or offered price of materials of domestic origin shall be deemed to be unreasonable, or the purchase of such materials shall be deemed to be inconsistent with the public interest, if the bid or offered price thereof exceeds the sum of the bid or of-

¹ 19 Fed. Reg. 8723.

ferred price of like materials of foreign origin and a differential computed as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

(c) The executive agency concerned shall in each instance determine the amount of the differential referred to in subsection (b) of this section on the basis of one of the following-described formulas, subject to the terms thereof:

(1) The sum determined by computing six per centum of the bid or offered price of materials of foreign origin.

(2) The sum determined by computing ten per centum of the bid or offered price of materials of foreign origin exclusive of applicable duty and all costs incurred after arrival in the United States; provided that when the bid or offered price of materials of foreign origin amounts to less than \$25,000, the sum shall be determined by computing ten per centum of such price exclusive only of applicable duty.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this order shall affect the authority or responsibility of an executive agency:

(a) To reject any bid or offer for reasons of the national interest not described or referred to in this order; or

(b) To place a fair proportion of the total purchases with small business concerns in accordance with section 302 (b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, section 2 (b) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, and section 202 of the Small Business Act of 1953; or

(c) To reject a bid or offer to furnish materials of foreign origin in any situation in which the domestic supplier offering the lowest price for furnishing the desired materials undertakes to produce substantially all of such materials in areas of substantial unemployment, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with such appropriate regulations as he may establish and during such period as the President may determine that it is in the national interest to provide to such areas preference in the award of Government contracts:

Provided, that nothing in this section shall prevent the rejection of a bid or offered price which is excessive; or

(d) To reject any bid or offer for materials of foreign origin if such rejection is necessary to protect essential national-security interests after receiving advice with respect thereto from the President or from any officer of the Government designated by the President to furnish such advice.

SEC. 4. The head of each executive agency shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to insure that procurement practices under his jurisdiction conform to the provisions of this order.

SEC. 5. This order shall apply only to contracts entered into after the date hereof. In any case in which the head of an executive agency proposing to purchase domestic materials determines that a greater differential than that provided in this order between the cost of such materials of domestic origin and materials of foreign origin is not unreasonable or that the purchase of materials of domestic origin is not inconsistent with the public interest, this order shall not apply. A written report of the facts of

each case in which such a determination is made shall be submitted to the President through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by the official making the determination within 30 days thereafter.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 17, 1954.

Schedule of Fees on Munitions Shipments Not in Force Until April

Press release 735 dated December 30

A schedule of fees for the licensing of munitions imports and exports, planned to be effective January 1, 1955,¹ will not be in force until April 1, 1955. The change is made to allow more time for the public to express itself on the proposed schedule.

The schedule of fees provides for a variable charge based on the licensed shipment ranging from \$1 for a licensed shipment of \$100 to \$80 for a licensed shipment of \$100,000 and over. No charge is made for licenses covering shipments amounting to less than \$100 in value.

Direct Defense Support for Laos, Cambodia, and Viet-Nam

Press release 739 dated December 31

Arrangements have been completed so that on January 1, 1955, the United States can begin supplying financial aid directly to the Governments of Viet-Nam, Cambodia, and Laos for the purpose of strengthening their defense against the threat of Communist subversion and aggression. This direct aid reaffirms the independent status these Governments now possess, and is in addition to the economic aid that has been given directly to these three states by the United States since 1950. The aid will be given pursuant to section 121 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, which provides for "the furnishing, as far as possible, of direct assistance to the Associated States of Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam . . ." The provision of U.S. aid directly to these Governments was confirmed by the communique issued at Washington on September 29 of this year,² following

¹ BULLETIN of Dec. 13, 1954, p. 917.

² BULLETIN of Oct. 11, 1954, p. 534.

talks between representatives of the United States, France, and the Chiefs of Mission of the three Associated States and by letters from President Eisenhower to the King of Cambodia³ and to President Diem of Viet-Nam.⁴

Return of Lend-Lease Vessels

Press release 729 dated December 23

The Soviet Government has agreed on the dates and procedures for the return to U.S. control of 27 small naval craft loaned to the Soviet Union under lend-lease during World War II. The 27 craft, consisting of 4 submarine chasers, 8 motor torpedo boats, and 15 landing craft (infantry), are to be turned over to U.S. Navy representatives at the port of Maizuru, Japan, during the months of June and July 1955.

These craft are part of a group of 186 naval craft, the return of which the United States first requested on September 3, 1948. The Soviet Government agreed to return the 186 craft on October 20, 1953, and on December 28, 1953, representatives of the two Governments began to work out the necessary details for the return of the craft.⁵ In May and June 38 naval craft, consisting of 12 motor torpedo boats and 26 submarine chasers, were returned to U.S. Navy control at the port of Istanbul, Turkey.⁶

Discussions are continuing on the ports, dates, and procedures for the return of the other 121 naval craft.

Rejection of Higher Duties on Screen-Printed Silk Scarves

White House press release dated December 23

The President on December 23 declined to accept the recommendations of the U.S. Tariff Commission for an increase in the duty on imports of screen-printed silk scarves.

The Tariff Commission's investigation into screen-printed silk scarves was made pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act. The Tariff Commission's original investigation

and report were augmented by a supplemental investigation and report made at the President's request.¹

The President, in identical letters to Senator Eugene D. Millikin, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Representative Daniel A. Reed, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, stated that he had serious question as to the need for the proposed action and as to its probable efficacy.

Text of President's Letter

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have now completed my study of the Tariff Commission's supplemental report on its escape clause investigation relating to screen-printed silk scarves. In its original report the Commission recommended an increase in the duty on imports of these scarves, but certain questions led me to return the report to the Commission with the request that it make a further careful examination of the case.

From the beginning, one of the dominant problems of this case has been an unusual difficulty in ascertaining whether serious injury from imports could be clearly established. Many differing and varied operations are involved in the domestic manufacture of screen-printed silk scarves. Manager-jobbers, whose firms are known in the trade as "scarf houses," estimate market possibilities and determine what shall be made and where, importing finished scarves or contracting to have scarves made domestically from their own cloth. Also involved are the domestic screen-printers, cutters and hemmers who work under contract from the scarf houses, some of whom specialize in work on scarves.

The manager-jobbers claim no injury and seek no tariff relief. To a greater extent than they formerly did, they are today relying upon importation rather than domestic manufacture to meet their needs. Furthermore, they handle other articles as well as scarves and consequently, although sales of all screen-printed silk scarves by thirty-one representative firms declined between 1952 and 1953, manager-jobbers' sales of other kinds of scarves, other neckwear and accessories increased more than enough to offset the decline in the sale of screen-printed silk scarves.

¹ Copies of the Tariff Commission's reports may be obtained from the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D. C.

³ *Ibid.*, Oct. 25, 1954, p. 615.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Nov. 15, 1954, p. 735.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Jan 11, 1954, p. 44.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Apr. 12, 1954, p. 563.

The substantial decline in domestic production of screen-printed silk scarves has presented a different problem for the screen-printers, cutters and hemmers, however. But with little adaptation each of these operations can be employed in the production of articles other than scarves. The screen-printers' skills are also utilized in the manufacture of dress fabrics, men's ties and drapery fabrics.

Services performed by cutters and hemmers in the manufacture of screen-printed scarves are also used elsewhere, for example in the manufacture of other neckwear, blouses, and accessories. In the ladies' wear industry centering around New York City it is commonplace for plant operators and employees alike to shift with a high degree of mobility from the manufacture of one article to another. Under the circumstances, therefore, although it is clear that domestic scarf production has declined, it is not clear that serious injury has resulted.

Another important question in this case relates to the effect that a tariff increase would produce. It might well just reduce imports or increase their cost without appreciably improving the market for domestic scarves. And with fashion playing a large role in determining the size of the total market for scarves, it becomes especially problematical to say what the net result of a tariff increase might be. Sales of scarves from all sources are in a general decline. Scarf imports were lower in 1953 than in 1952 and during the first nine months of 1954 a further 30% decline occurred.

A new factor which may appreciably influence the silk scarf import situation is the Flammable Fabrics Act which became effective last July. This measure was enacted to prevent interstate com-

merce in highly flammable fabrics and articles. It prohibits trade in wearing apparel, including scarves, which cannot pass a prescribed test of flammability. The full effect of this Act on imports of silk scarves is somewhat difficult to measure because the law has been in effect for such a short time. Present indications are that substantial quantities of the thinner scarves, which are also the cheapest, are failing to pass the standards imposed by the Act for shipments in interstate commerce. If these preliminary indications are borne out by greater experience, the scarves that do meet the test of the law will be the heavier, higher-priced scarves in the production and sale of which domestic manufacturers enjoy their greatest success.

My review of all of these factors leaves with me serious questions as to the need for the proposed action and as to its probable efficacy. Scarves are an important Japanese export specialty and it is Japan's trade that would be mainly affected by an increase in the tariff on imported scarves. A stronger and more stable Japanese economy is of major importance to Japan and to the free world. Our current efforts to expand Japan's trading opportunities by inducing other countries to join us in lowering trade barriers against Japanese goods is an important link in our over-all security effort. Restrictive action which would affect mainly a Japanese product would be warranted at this time, therefore, only if it were clearly and unmistakably required.

In the light of all these aspects of the case, I have decided not to take any action to increase the tariff on imports of screen-printed silk scarves.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Preservation of International Metric Standards

TENTH GENERAL CONFERENCE ON WEIGHTS AND MEASURES PARIS AND SÈVRES, FRANCE, OCTOBER 5-14, 1954

by E. C. Crittenden

Continuing a series begun in 1889, the Tenth General Conference on Weights and Measures was held at Paris and Sèvres, France, October 5 to 14, 1954. Of 35 countries belonging to the international organization, 32 sent delegates or observers, the total number being more than 70. As representatives of the United States the Department of State appointed Dr. Allen V. Astin, director of the National Bureau of Standards, and Dr. E. C. Crittenden, consultant to the Bureau.

These General Conferences, which are convened at 6-year intervals, exercise general authority over a permanent International Committee on Weights and Measures of 18 members, which meets each 2 years. The Committee is responsible for directing all projects in metrology which the member countries decide to undertake jointly, including the preservation of the international metric standards and other activities of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures.

The Bureau, with a staff of about 16 persons, is housed at Sèvres in the Pavillon de Breteuil, an ancient residence dedicated as international territory. Besides providing a depository for international standards it carries on important researches on many metrological problems, calibrates standards for other laboratories, both national and privately owned, and serves as a permanent secretariat for the International Committee and the General Conferences on Weights and Measures.

Problems of measurement have become so diverse that no single small group of men can deal with them. Consequently, to assist the International Committee on Weights and Measures in special fields four advisory committees have been set up.

Each of these committees includes representatives of seven or eight national laboratories and some experts selected individually from smaller countries. The present advisory committees cover measurements and standards in electricity, in photometry, and in thermometry, and the project for a new definition of the meter.

Many countries which belong to the international weights and measures organization do not have representatives in the permanent committees. Consequently, one of the purposes served by each General Conference is to inform member countries of the progress made during the preceding 6-year interval. The Conferences make decisions on matters of principle and on changes of policy or practice.

Reports on Work of Bureau

Current work of the International Bureau was reported to the Conference by the director, Charles Volet, and by various members of his staff. One phase of their review dealt with comparisons of electrical and photometric standards from all of the larger countries, showing a very satisfactory degree of uniformity in the new electrical units, as adopted in 1948, and good progress toward uniformity of photometric measurements on all types of lamps. Comparisons of end-gages calibrated at various national laboratories by means of light-waves indicated that such calibrations are now sufficiently precise to meet the ordinary needs of industry but that the measurements would not be fully satisfactory for the establishment of basic standards, because the results obtained in different

countries might differ by as much as 5-hundredths of a micron on a 100-millimeter gage, that is, 5 parts in 10 million. Further research is needed to determine the causes of these discrepancies.

In many physical measurements the force of gravity at the particular location must be known or assumed. The International Bureau therefore has in progress a determination of that force at Sèvres. Preliminary results reported to the Conference indicate that the "Potsdam" basis for values of gravity, which has been generally used for half a century, is too large by 24 parts in a million. This agrees rather closely with determinations made at the National Bureau of Standards and the British National Physical Laboratory. However, additional determinations are under way in other laboratories. Consequently, the International Committee, following a recommendation of its Advisory Committee on Thermometry, agreed that values of the force of gravity involved in the determination of atmospheric pressures should conform to the classical Potsdam system until the International Committee approves a change.

The International Bureau also reported the results of a recalibration of national kilogram standards completed since the Ninth General Conference in 1948. Of 24 standards originally certified in 1889, 2 showed no perceptible changes, 14 had slight apparent increases in mass, and 8 showed small losses, the largest loss being 6-hundredths of a milligram, or 6 parts in 100 million. Kilogram No. 20, which belongs to the United States, appeared to have increased by 2 parts in 100 million between 1889 and 1948, but, if this was a real change, nine-tenths of it occurred before 1937 when the last previous comparison was made. The weighings of 1889 were not sufficiently precise to make it certain that any change has occurred in any of the national standards except one.

An intercomparison of national and international meter bars is scheduled to begin in 1955, and on this account special attention was directed to the possibility of increasing the precision of observations by ruling new lines to replace the original ones on the bars distributed in 1889. It is claimed that the lines can now be made so much better as to reduce the uncertainty of calibrations by a factor of 10. Additional lines can also be ruled to give a length of one meter when the bar is at 20° C. instead of 0°. Some countries have

expressed a desire to have their meter standards reengraved to gain these advantages.

Redefinition of Meter Unit

On the project to redefine the meter unit by basing it on wave-lengths of light in a spectral line given by some single isotope, definite progress was reported. The Advisory Committee on Definition of the Meter, at a meeting in September 1953, recommended that when a new definition is adopted it shall be expressed in terms of a wave-length in vacuum, derived from the presently accepted wave-length of the red cadmium line in air under standard conditions. The conversion from air to vacuum wave-lengths is to be made in accordance with a formula for the dispersion of normal air adopted in 1952 by a Commission on Spectroscopy recognized as the best authority in this field.

The International Committee approved this procedure for developing the new definition, but the actual adoption of a definition was not possible because four different isotopes have been proposed as sources of light suitable for this purpose. Dr. W. F. Meggers of the National Bureau of Standards several years ago proposed that the wave-length of the green line of mercury of mass number 198 be adopted. Workers at the German Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt have advocated the use of a line in the spectrum of krypton 86 and this year have added xenon 136 as another possibility. Reports from the Russian Institute of Metrology have favored the retention of cadmium, using, however, the single isotope cadmium 114 instead of the natural metal.

The British National Physical Laboratory and the Canadian National Research Council Laboratory have studied some of these possibilities, but more information concerning the spectral lines of the isotopes, the types of lamps to be used, and other operating conditions is needed to give a basis for choice of a particular line. Consequently the Conference, while recognizing the progress made, urged the laboratories to expedite their work on monochromatic radiations in order that the Eleventh General Conference may reach a decision on the problem.

Redefinition of Unit of Time

The question of defining a unit of time more constant in value than the mean solar second as

now determined by current astronomical observations was brought up by a resolution adopted by the International Union of Astronomy in 1952. The astronomers point out that the length of the mean solar day has varied by as much as 1 part in 10 million during the period from 1870 to 1950, and there is no assurance that even larger variations will not occur. Consequently the Union recommended that for highly precise data (such as the frequencies assigned for some radio signals) the second be taken as a fraction of a single specified year. The formal resolution, however, referred to a "sidereal" year when it should have said "tropical" year. Consequently, the General Conference did not consider it advisable to act on the recommendation. Instead it authorized the International Committee to decide the matter without waiting until another General Conference convenes. The second will presumably be defined as "the fraction $1/31\,556\,925.975$ of the tropical year 1900.0."

In accordance with a recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Thermometry, the Conference adopted a new definition of the thermodynamic or absolute scale of temperature by assigning the value 273.16°K for the triple point of water as the sole fixed fundamental point of the scale. This method of defining the scale has been advocated in recent years by Professor W. F. Giaque of the University of California but was originally suggested 100 years ago by Lord Kelvin. Furthermore, any changes in assigned temperatures resulting from the change in definition of the scale are not likely to be greater than the uncertainty of present measures. The name Kelvin is therefore retained.

In response to a request from the International Organization for Standardization for the establishment of a standard value for normal atmospheric pressure, the Conference announced that the value adopted by the Ninth General Conference in the definition of the International Temperature Scale should be accepted for all purposes. It is $1\,013\,250$ dynes per square centimeter, or, in the meter-kilogram-second system, $101\,325$ newtons per square meter.

A proposal for the establishment of a system of practical units for use by all countries, submitted by the French Government in 1948, gave rise to such diverse comments that the International Committee was unable to prepare a generally acceptable revision. By a divided vote on some details, the

Conference decided that as a basis for such a system the following units should be adopted: for length, the meter; for mass, the kilogram; for time, the second; for electric current, the ampere; for thermodynamic temperature, the degree Kelvin; for luminous intensity, the candela.

Financial Report

With regard to finances it was reported that, following a request made by the Ninth General Conference, 21 countries have made special gifts totaling about 79,000 gold francs (\$25,800) for the improvement of the plant and equipment of the International Bureau. Although the United States Government has made no special cash gift in response to this request, it may be recalled that private American agencies have in the past given material assistance to the International Bureau. In particular, the Rockefeller Foundation gave funds for the enlargement of the Bureau laboratory to provide room for work on electrical standards.

By action of the International Committee, valid because delegates of no country objected when the decision was reported to the Conference, the basic budget (contributions of countries which adhered to the Convention of the Meter before 1921) was increased from 175,000 gold francs to 300,000. On a corresponding scale eight countries which have adhered more recently will pay 55,000 gold francs, making the total of dues for the support of the International Bureau 355,000 gold francs (\$116,000) per year.

Membership of International Committee

The final act of the General Conference was the election of members of the International Committee to bring the membership up to the total of 18, as provided by the Convention of the Meter. Five members elected in 1948 or earlier remain. These are from Argentina, Italy, Rumania, Sweden, and Yugoslavia. Eight members elected provisionally by the International Committee between 1948 and 1954 were confirmed. These members are from Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The remaining five vacancies were filled by electing members from Australia, Austria, Finland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Dr. Astin is the new American

member, succeeding Dr. Crittenden, who resigned at the close of the Conference. At a meeting after the Conference, the International Committee elected, as its president, André Danjon, director of the Observatory of Paris; as vice president, Dr. Richard Vieweg, president of the German Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt; and as secretary, Professor G. Cassinis, rector of the Polytechnic School of Milan, Italy.

The present membership of the International Committee is as follows:

Allen V. Astin	Director, United States National Bureau of Standards
H. Barrell	Superintendent, Metrology Division, British National Physical Laboratory
G. D. Bourdoun	Vice-Director, Central Chamber of Measurements and Instruments, U. S. S. R.
G. Cassinis	Rector and Professor in the Polytechnic School of Milan, Italy
André Danjon	Director of the Observatory of Paris
N. A. Esserman	Chief, Division of Metrology, National Standards Laboratory of Australia
J. de Boer	Professor, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
R. H. Field	Chief, Section of Metrology, National Research Council Laboratory, Canada
M. T. Isnardi	Professor, Faculty of Sciences, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina
C. Kargatchin	Section Chief in the Ministry of Commerce of Yugoslavia
J. Nussberger	Director, Service of Weights and Measures of Czechoslovakia
José M. Otero	Director, Institute of Optics, "Daza de Valdes," Madrid, Spain
M. Siegbahn	Nobel Institute for Physics, Stockholm 50, Sweden
C. Stasescu	Technical Adviser, Service of Weights and Measures of Rumania
Josef Stulla-Götz	Consultant, Bundesamt für Eich- und Vermessungswesen, of Austria
Richard Vieweg	President, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt, Germany
A. Väisälä	Finland
Ziro Yamauti	Professor, First Faculty of Engineering, University of Tokyo, Japan

Charles Volet, *ex officio*

Director, International Bureau of Weights and Measures

● *Dr. Crittenden, author of the above article, is a consultant at the National Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and served as a representative of the United States at the Tenth General Conference on Weights and Measures. He was formerly a member of the International Committee on Weights and Measures.*

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Economic Commission for Asia and Far East, Subcommittee on Trade

The Department of State announced on December 30 (press release 734) that Eugene M. Braderman, Director, Far Eastern Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce, had been designated U.S. representative to the first session of the subcommittee on trade of the Committee on Industry and Trade of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), to be held at Hong Kong from January 6 to 12, 1955.

Mr. Braderman will be assisted by the following advisers:

Charles L. Hodge, Office of Chinese Affairs, Department of State

Ralph H. Hunt, American Consulate General, Hong Kong
C. Philip Clock, American Consulate General, Singapore

At its sixth session (Kandy, Ceylon, January 26-February 4, 1954), the Committee on Industry and Trade concluded that, while two trade promotion conferences which had been held under the auspices of ECAFE had laid a valuable foundation for trade promotion activities in the region, there was need for a standing subsidiary organ to insure regular and thorough examination of trade problems at a technical level. It consequently established the subcommittee on trade with the following terms of reference: (1) to review the trade and commercial policies of the countries of the region and to promote the development of interregional and intraregional trade, with a view to assisting the economic development of the countries of the region; (2) to review the progress made by the countries of the region in the development of tech-

niques and methods for trade promotion, including the training of trade promotion personnel; and (3) to study other problems affecting international trade, such as price stabilization of commodities, commercial arbitration, market research, and freight rates, having due regard to the work being done in these fields by the United Nations and other international agencies.

The provisional agenda for the meeting provides for a review of the trade promotion activities of the ECAFE secretariat, a review of current trade

developments, and the presentation and discussion of statements by the various Delegations on the trade and commercial policies, bilateral trade agreements, barter arrangements, quotas, and licensing procedures of their respective countries. Special study will be made of questions relating to the market analysis of hides and skins for Asia and the Far East, commercial arbitration facilities, and standardization in the ECAFE region. In addition, the participants will adopt a program of work for the subcommittee.

Freedom of Information as a Weapon for Peace

Statement by A. M. Ade Johnson

U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

In virtually all of the great, as well as small, tasks undertaken by the United Nations, we are greatly dependent on a thing known as truth. It is sometimes an elusive commodity, even to us here in the United Nations, where we have fullest access to archives, reports, and other historical and technical materials. It is much more elusive to those who do not have these valuable materials at their fingertips. Throughout the whole history of mankind—certainly in historic times—there has been a constant search for truth in a world where truth is sometimes hard to pin down. There has been a constant struggle between truth on one side and falsehood, rumor, and half-truths on the other. So important has this struggle been to all peoples that it is reflected not only in the writings of recognized scientists, teachers, and philosophers, but in the ancient folklore of peoples everywhere. I am reminded of an old folktale of Ethiopia which recounts how Truth and Falsehood, after outwitting their enemies, were left on the field confronting each other. They fought, and Truth vanquished Falsehood. But Falsehood again arose from the ground and they fought again. Again Falsehood was beaten, but soon he rose and fought again. So

it is, this old tale tells us, that truth and falsehood are destined to combat as long as the world exists. Truth will win, but it must fight again and again.

John Milton echoed this ancient faith in the supremacy of truth when he wrote: "Let truth and falsehood grapple; whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?"

At no time in human history has it been more necessary for all men to know the truth. The world has shrunk mightily in the past few centuries. What more convincing evidence can there be of this fact than that we are sitting here together in this committee—representatives of 60 nations in every part of the earth—discussing our mutual problems? The problems of one people have inescapably become the problems of all of us. In seeking solutions of our common problems, whatever we do is dependent upon our understanding of truth. Even more, it is dependent on the understanding of truth held by the peoples whom we represent.

With the invention of printing, man was presented with a boon and a challenge. Printing made possible the dissemination of ideas on a wide and expanding scale. Radio and television have made the spread of ideas almost instantaneous. Our obligation is to see to it that the people of our countries have the constant and ever-present opportunity to disentangle truth from the web of

¹ Made in Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) on Nov. 30 (U. S. Delegation press release 2048).

conflicting ideas. They must have the chance to decide for themselves what is good for them and for all of us. We have the obligation, in short, of destroying the barriers which may exist against the free exchange of information and ideas. Without this, the hope we have of solving many of our common problems may come to nothing.

At no time in our history has the need for a free flow of information been more real than today, when we have produced an almost incredible mechanical and atomic technology. This technology is a critical factor in the relations between nations, and between governments and their peoples. How it is to be used for our common welfare must be determined by the world's peoples in an atmosphere of enlightenment. Our technology must remain an instrument which works for us, and not against us. Without the free exchange of ideas and information, without full access to different aspects of the truth, when it is impossible for us to compare and weigh one assertion against a contrary assertion, we cannot adequately master and use our technical knowledge. Such barricades to truth can only result in the loss of man's power to control his environment, and the loss of his power to make decisions for the common good, and the loss of his political freedom as well.

The development of a free press—of the right to voice facts or opinions in print—is the story of our struggle against repressive concepts of government. Those concepts, unfortunately, persist tenaciously in certain parts of the world today. In some instances we observe partial attempts to control national and international thinking, to withhold facts which people have an inalienable right to know. We find varying degrees of censorship of news at national boundaries, where some governments are attempting to deprive their own citizens of information known elsewhere, or to prevent news known within the country from getting out. This is no contribution whatsoever to a better informed and better world, or to the freedom of the citizens of any single nation, or—in the long run—to the durable and just peace which is undoubtedly one of the prime objectives of the United Nations.

We are confronted, however, with another phenomenon which is even more grim. Within certain political areas of our 20th century world we find governmental systems which not only hamper and restrict the flow of information across their borders but maintain a strangling control over

everything that their citizens may read in their newspapers and magazines, over everything they may hear on their radios, and what they may see on television, on films, or in the theater. This situation can do nothing else but deprive vast populations of the capacity for making sound judgments, for knowing what others think, and for sensing the community of interests which peoples everywhere share. It can contribute nothing to peace, but on the contrary can only create a deep pool of misunderstandings that conceivably could lead to war.

In exploring the question of freedom of information, as with all other vital matters, the better we can marshal the facts the better we will be able to bring our judgments and recommendations to bear. As we know, the Economic and Social Council at its 17th session passed resolutions on freedom of information which initiated action and study of 12 different aspects of this problem. That it was able to make so many decisions was due in great measure to the substantive facts and keen analyses provided by the rapporteur, Mr. Salvador Lopez, in his excellent report.² One of the least inspiring episodes of the 17th session was the abuse visited on Mr. Lopez for his forthright and courageous presentation of facts about censorship and other obstacles to free exchange of information. My delegation hopes—I think we all hope—that this kind of situation will not arise again. I believe we are all interested in the benefits of freedom of news. And I am sure we will be in a better position to share these benefits as the facts become more familiar to us.

U. S. Traditions

Mr. Chairman, as the rapporteur so generously acknowledged in his report, my country was founded on principles among which freedom of speech and freedom of the press rank very high. The very first amendment to the United States Constitution, adopted in 1791, prohibits the Federal Government from infringing on these freedoms. That amendment states, in simple language:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

² U.N. doc. E/2426 and Add. 1 to 5.

Moreover, an amendment to the Federal Constitution in 1868 reinforced the deep-rooted principle of a free press by prohibiting the State governments from enacting any laws which would "abridge the privileges or immunities" of American citizens as proclaimed in the Constitution. Indeed, the constitutions of virtually every State within the Union impose clearest restraints on their governments against curtailing freedom of the press and speech.

There is no basic right to which Americans are more alert than the freedom to speak and be heard; the right to know the facts and to criticize or applaud them as they choose; the right to hear both sides of a question; the right to formulate their interpretation of facts and assertions on the basis of their own best human judgment; and the right to challenge assertions and weigh the evidence.

I believe my country has contributed greatly during the course of its history toward consolidating and strengthening the fundamental principle of freedom of information. It is a principle dear to us, and we shall continue to support it in every way possible.

In the United States today there are approximately 20,000 newspapers and periodicals published on a regular basis. Twelve thousand of them are newspapers, and of these 1,775 are daily papers. More than 1,400 of the dailies are independents. I do not think I need to labor the point that wide differences of opinion are voiced by these papers, just as different opinions are voiced in the press of many other nations represented here.

It is readily observable that among the newspapers of this city, for example, there is considerable divergence in the treatment of news and interpretation of events. There are four morning papers, three afternoon papers. There are numerous language journals—Slavic, Chinese, Italian, Spanish, French, and others—many of which have news sources of their own. There are business papers and labor papers. There is even the *Daily Worker*. I think there can be little question of the news not being available to citizens of this city, and this is equally true of cities throughout the country. Some small towns may have only a single daily paper of their own, but also accessible are the journals of nearby towns and cities. In addition, virtually every home in the nation—in fact, almost every automobile—has a radio. And

there are an estimated 30 million television receivers, on which news from the major services and specialized services is available.

It is very important that we do what we can to encourage the development of independent domestic information enterprises everywhere. The Economic and Social Council took full note of this need in Resolution 522 (XVII)K on the encouragement and development of independent domestic information enterprises. If we are to have freedom of information in the real sense of the word, there must be independent sources of information. Only if there are many informative media and only if they are really independent will they be able to give their readers and listeners the opportunity to discern truth for themselves. If truth and falsehood are to grapple, as Milton put it, then they must be permitted to meet face to face.

It is also our view that control by any single management group of press, radio, television, or film would not be in the public interest. There are three competing large news services in the United States—the United Press, the International News Service, and the Associated Press. There are also smaller syndicates and agencies, such as the North American Newspaper Alliance. These news-gathering organizations are in competition with one another. Their reputations, their livelihood, and their very survival depend upon their speed, their accuracy, and their ability to get the news and the news-behind-the-news. They provide news and information resources that otherwise would be unavailable to the smaller newspapers without large amounts of money to invest in news coverage. In addition to the news agencies, many papers have their own correspondents assigned to overseas posts, to the National Capital, and to special events and international conferences of all kinds. Papers like the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald-Tribune*, which have a large staff of foreign correspondents, make their special dispatches available to other newspapers throughout the nation. And numerous papers in the United States subscribe to foreign services. All these services are in competition with one another. They are also in competition with weekly news publications, such as *Newsweek*, *Time* magazine, and others. Because of this intensive competition, the pressures for ever-increasing accuracy and fuller coverage of news are acute.

And I would like to point out that the United States Government does not own, subsidize, operate, or control a single domestic news service, newspaper, radio station, or television station. In the licensing of domestic radio transmitters, as a matter of historic policy, the Federal Government is deeply concerned with the prevention of monopoly and with assuring that stations will observe the highest standards of fair play.

Mr. Chairman, I am not citing these details out of boastfulness. I am well aware that a vast majority of the nations here have a comparable interest in the dissemination of news and the free exchange of opinion. We are only one nation among many which cherish the hard-won heritage of press freedom, of freedom of information.

But this committee has a vital concern in establishing the true character of information monopolies and in discouraging them. There has been allusion in the past to the possible monopolistic nature of the big press services, and I think we ought to be quite clear that bigness in free enterprise does not in itself constitute monopoly. In the United States we are in fact protected from monopoly by the very competition I have just cited.

Results of Information Monopoly

If we seek to know what information monopoly really is let us look elsewhere. Let us take note of those nations where there are no private news services at all; where a government exercises the most rigid controls over all information media; where that government specifies what a newspaper or magazine may say or not say and screens news from the outside world—or prohibits it altogether—with a view to eliminating ideas or facts that contravert government policy. Mr. Lopez noted in his report last year that this situation in the Soviet Union produces “the greatest of all information monopolies—a vast political monopoly which is monolithic both in structure and in function.” Advocates and supporters of this kind of monopoly attempt to justify it (if they do not try to deny it) on the grounds that the prime purpose of information media is to further social objectives. I am impressed by the way the Lopez report of last year analyzed this rationale. I quote from the report:

No one would deny that the Press is a major social force which must therefore put the general above the

private good. But the *only* way in which the Press can perform this important function, the only way in which it can be a positive force for democratic and social progress is by providing a forum for the public discussion of what those social goals should be. The only measure of substantive freedom which exists in the Soviet Press is the limited freedom (known as “self-criticism”) to discuss the strictly technical means for achieving predetermined economic and social goals. No general public discussion, in the Press or elsewhere, of what those goals should be is permitted.

Under conditions of this kind, as the report points out, the press is the instrument of a political monopoly designed to perform an authoritarian function. There is no room in it for the dynamic social function of providing a forum for the free public discussion of ends and means.

Mr. Chairman, we are aware of abuses of the right of public information in many parts of the world. Abuses exist in varying degrees. But the planned news control that we find in the Soviet-dominated areas today is the most complete, the most thorough, and the most intolerant of freedom of ideas.

Early last month in Calcutta, Prime Minister Nehru of India commented on some of his observations regarding Communist China, which he had just visited. He noted—with a good deal of disappointment—that “there was no opposition newspaper permitted in China.” He said it was difficult to know what was happening elsewhere in the world by reading the Chinese newspapers. He said that in order to keep in touch with developments in the outside world he had to depend on news bulletins of the Indian Embassy in Peiping.

Mr. Chairman, it is to conditions such as these that we must give predominant attention if true freedom of information on a worldwide scale is to become a reality.

One of the resolutions of the 17th session of the Economic and Social Council calls for keeping under scrutiny the violations of freedom of information which have been noted. It requests the Secretary-General to provide the 19th session of the Council with a “world-wide survey of current principles and practices involved in the censorship of outgoing news dispatches.” It further requests the Secretary-General to provide “a study of public and private information monopolies and their effects on freedom of information.” It is the view of my delegation that these studies will be invaluable to our proper understanding of condi-

tions and practices which exist and of how such conditions are affecting the exchange of dissemination of news.

But censorship is only the negative aspect of our problem. We are also all aware, I think, that some communities are not equipped with strong independent information enterprises because they lack the technical means and even the technical knowledge. The Economic and Social Council has recommended authorizing the extension of technical assistance in the field of freedom of information. My delegation, in cooperation with others, has offered a resolution which will make it possible for the Secretary-General to render services in this field, in line with the Council's recommendations.³

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance in freedom of information is of two kinds. Assistance relating to telecommunications, paper pulp, paper newsprint, modernization of plants, technical training of printers, and so on, can in many cases qualify under the terms of the expanded program of technical assistance. The Economic and Social Council has already taken the necessary action to recommend to the agencies participating in the expanded program that they give due consideration to requests which governments may submit for such aid.

There are other parts of the program which would be related to social activity and the promotion of the rights and freedoms recognized under the charter and the Universal Declaration. Where such technical assistance would not be related directly to economic development, it should be offered under the regular program of the United Nations. To the greatest extent possible, the proposed assistance should be provided within the limit of available funds and by utilizing the services of staff members already employed in the Secretariat. If any substantial number of requests should be received, this eventually may require an adjustment of allocation of resources for technical assistance under the regular budget. My Government recognizes this and believes that this field of activity is so important that such action would be fully justified.

³ U.N. doc. A/C. 3/L. 448 and Add. 1, sponsored by Chile, Ecuador, Lebanon, Mexico, the Philippines, Sweden, and the United States; adopted by Committee III on Dec. 7 by a vote of 47-1-1 and in plenary on Dec. 17 by a vote of 53-0-2.

May I point out that this resolution would merely grant authority to the Secretary-General to render technical assistance in a field where he does not now have that authority. The resolution would not require any state to request technical assistance, nor would it require the Secretary-General to render technical assistance. The resolution would merely extend the field in which the Secretary-General might render technical assistance if requested by a state.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of our work in regard to freedom of information is very great. It involves much more than a basic philosophical or humanitarian right. It deeply involves the welfare of our small, 20th-century world. We have many complicated and vital issues which we shall have to solve together, because they concern all of us. We must all have free access to information. We must know what the contrary points of view are. We must know this not only in the halls of the United Nations but in the villages and countryside of every continent. Otherwise many people will be deprived of the capacity to bring their best judgment to bear on the vital questions that confront us. I, for one, have only the greatest confidence in the human race. If more people have access to all the known facts and to one another's views, our other tasks will be lightened. Freedom of information can prove itself to be one of the great weapons of peace.

Law Commission Asked To Submit Final Report on High Seas Problems

STATEMENT BY CHARLES H. MAHONEY
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY¹

I would like to explain briefly the position of my Government with respect to the item which we have now begun to consider. The United States Government took the initiative, along with several other governments, in proposing this item for the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.² This initiative was taken because of my Government's conclusion that a consideration by the Assembly of the Continental Shelf prob-

¹ Made in Committee VI (Legal) on Nov. 29 (U.S. delegation press release 2045).

² BULLETIN of Sept. 20, 1954, p. 422.

lem, and, in particular, the draft articles on the Continental Shelf which were submitted last year to the General Assembly by the International Law Commission,³ should be undertaken as early as possible. It is the view of my Government that this consideration will provide a helpful and valuable first step in working out eventual international agreement on this important problem, a problem which, so long as it remains unsettled, seems bound to give rise to increasingly serious disputes among nations.

We are all, of course, aware that at its eighth session last year the Assembly decided "not to deal with any aspect of the regime of the high seas or of the regime of territorial waters until all the problems involved have been studied by the International Law Commission and reported upon by it to the General Assembly." This decision appears to have been based upon the view that, because of the logical relationship which links together all of the great variety of subjects which fall under the headings "regime of the high seas" and "regime of territorial waters," a satisfactory consideration of any of these separately would be impossible. Such a point of view appears to have arisen out of what my delegation considers to have been an extreme of caution, to insure that any decision which might be taken by the Assembly regarding any single aspect of the general subject matter should not in any way prejudice the decision which the Assembly might later take regarding any other aspect of the problem. And, consequently, under this Resolution 798 (VIII), the Assembly last year decided in effect to put off for an indeterminate period any consideration at all of any of the great number of problems relating to the territorial sea and the high seas—problems which are becoming of increasingly pressing concern to a number of the states of the world.

Under the decision taken last year, the Assembly cannot even begin its search for a solution to these problems but must mark time for what promises to be, in the view of my Government, too long a time. We recognize that the draft articles on the Continental Shelf were submitted to the Assembly at its eighth session too late to permit governments to prepare adequately for substantive discussion of the articles and that consequently some sort of decision to postpone consideration

was necessarily a proper one for the Assembly to take. My Government has taken the initiative this year to reopen Assembly consideration of the subject because it is convinced that the period of postponement embodied in last year's decision was overly long.

My Government does not consider that the problems relating to the Continental Shelf are so linked to problems relating to other aspects of the regimes of the high seas and of territorial waters as to require that their consideration be postponed until the International Law Commission has completed all of its work on all of the great range of problems involved. Indeed, the International Law Commission could not have felt that a separate consideration by the Assembly of the various problems was impossible or inadvisable since the Commission itself has considered separately its own recommendations for disposition by the General Assembly of the drafts of articles on the Continental Shelf and articles covering the basic aspects of the international regulation of fisheries. In fact, we believe a separate consideration of the subject of the Continental Shelf could work a real advantage, because agreement on this subject may actually facilitate consideration and agreement on other related problems which the Assembly might subsequently consider.

None of us here needs to be reminded that the Continental Shelf has been the subject of varying points of view. This variance has not been simply one over details of a concept which has received general acceptance among states, but there exists basic disagreement which in its ramifications seriously threatens the substance of the vital principle of freedom of the seas. My Government attaches the greatest importance to this principle and consequently considers it of importance that steps be not long delayed to work out, in the United Nations, agreement on the problems which relate to the Continental Shelf. A large number of the frequent disputes which arise out of the exercise or attempted exercise of jurisdiction by coastal states over the ships of other states have as an important underlying factor a difference of view concerning the scope of the concept of the Continental Shelf. The United States Government views with increasingly serious concern these disputes and incidents which have been occurring. We think that the underlying causes of these disputes require the prompt attention of the General Assembly, and we urge other governments to join

³ U.N. doc. A/2456, chapter III.

with us in agreeing now to begin an exploration of the Continental Shelf problem at the Assembly's next session.

In our view the draft articles on the Continental Shelf which have been submitted by the International Law Commission provide the best basis for discussions of the subject, and my delegation has joined with the delegations of Belgium, China, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom in sponsoring the draft resolution which is now before the Committee (Document A/C.6/L.339). You will note that this draft resolution, if adopted by the Assembly, would record the view that any decisions taken with respect to the draft articles on the Continental Shelf should be without prejudice to the question of the breadth of the territorial seas. In addition to providing for a decision to include the item of the draft articles on the Continental Shelf in the provisional agenda for the 10th session, the resolution also takes account of the necessity of securing an early consideration by the Assembly of the other important problems which relate to the regime of the high seas and the regime of the territorial waters, by containing a request that the International Law Commission give special attention to its study of these topics.⁴

TEXT OF RESOLUTION⁵

U.N. doc. A/Resolution/267

The General Assembly,

Considering that the International Law Commission in its report on the work of the fifth session submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly draft articles on the continental shelf,

Believing that consideration by the General Assembly of the régime of the high seas, the régime of territorial wa-

⁴The sponsors of the draft resolution accepted amendments submitted by Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Iceland, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay (U. N. doc. A/C.6/L.341/Rev.1). In a statement to the committee on Dec. 3, Mr. Mahoney said in discussing the amendments: "My delegation understands this new language as expressing the intent that the International Law Commission should finish with its study and, whether or not it reaches complete agreement, should submit its final report on the topics listed in the resolution, in time for consideration of these topics by the General Assembly at its eleventh regular session."

At the same meeting, the committee adopted the amended draft by a vote of 44-0-9.

⁵Adopted in plenary on Dec. 14 by a vote of 32-0-9.

ters and all related problems should be undertaken without undue delay,

Recalling that, in resolution 798 (VIII) of 7 December 1953, the General Assembly, having regard to the fact that the problems relating to the high seas, territorial waters, contiguous zones, the continental shelf and the superjacent waters were closely linked together juridically as well as physically, decided not to deal with any aspect of those matters until all the problems involved had been studied by the International Law Commission and reported upon by it to the General Assembly,

1. *Requests* the International Law Commission to devote the necessary time to the study of the régime of the high seas, the régime of territorial waters and all related problems in order to complete its work on these topics and submit its final report in time for the General Assembly to consider them as a whole, in accordance with resolution 798 (VIII), at its eleventh session;

2. *Decides* to include the final report of the International Law Commission on these topics in the provisional agenda for the eleventh session of the General Assembly.

U.N. To Convene Conference on Fishery Conservation

STATEMENT BY JAMES P. NASH
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY¹

Recent events have given renewed emphasis to many of the comments contained in the fisheries section of the report of the International Law Commission presented to the eighth session of the General Assembly.² These events would seem to justify terms used by the Commission such as "a condition approaching anarchy" and to indicate that in its choice of words the Commission may have even indulged in understatement when it said that the inadequacy of existing law on the subject results in conditions "productive of friction."

In the light of these events, my Government feels more than ever the urgency of United Nations consideration of the fishery question as the first step in resolving differences which are increasingly causing friction and ill feeling between friendly nations. The longer the United Nations delays consideration and action on the question, the greater is the opportunity for the fishery ques-

¹Made in Committee VI (Legal) on Dec. 3 (U. S. delegation press release 2055).

²U.N. doc. A/2456, paragraphs 94 and 102.

tion progressively to become more difficult. Differences which it may now be possible to reconcile may, if not dealt with promptly, grow to such proportions that they become major issues.

In view of the overwhelming arguments as to the urgency of this question, I think it need not be emphasized further. However, I would like to refer to some of the other issues which have been raised in connection with immediate consideration of the fishery question by the United Nations.

In its report to the eighth session of the General Assembly, the International Law Commission submitted its recommendations concerning fisheries. This was one of the several questions it was studying within the scope of the general topic of the "regime of the high seas." The latter topic has been under study by the International Law Commission since its first session in 1949.

By its action in submitting a separate draft of articles on fisheries after 4 years of study, the International Law Commission clearly indicated that this question can be considered separately from the other questions within the scope of the topic "regime of the high seas." In its report, the International Law Commission also referred to the "general importance and recognized urgency of the subject matter of the articles in question" and made the following comments:

It is generally recognized that the existing law on the subject, including the existing international agreements, provides no adequate protection of marine fauna against extermination. The resulting position constitutes, in the first instance, a danger to the food supply of the world. Also, insofar as it renders the coastal State or the States directly interested helpless against wasteful and predatory exploitation of fisheries by foreign nationals, it is productive of friction and constitutes an inducement to States to take unilateral action, which at present is probably illegal, or self-protection.

There may be some difference in opinion concerning these comments, but there can be little question that they apply in general to a large part of the world.

The United States Government is of the opinion that the International Law Commission has made an excellent contribution to the formulation of the problems and principles concerned in the conservation of international fisheries and that the Commission has progressed about as far as it can on the basis of legal considerations alone. It is, therefore, of the opinion that study of the *techni-*

cal and *administrative* aspects of international conservation and regulation of fisheries and the operation of international research and conservation bodies now is highly desirable if not essential to effective treatment and solution of the problems. The results of such study should be invaluable to the General Assembly when further consideration is given to this matter.

Through its experience in this field, involving eight conventions dealing with 20 other countries, the United States has become convinced that technical and administrative considerations play an exceedingly important role in determining the principles and courses of action which will contribute most to the successful handling of international fishery conservation problems. It seems reasonable that the United Nations should give careful consideration to technical and administrative phases of the matter of fisheries regulation and control before it takes action on a set of principles such as those proposed by the International Law Commission.

The United States Government is convinced that, as a practical matter, the question of fisheries can constructively be considered separately from other questions concerned with the "regime of the high seas." In fact, it seems highly probable that progress in solving fishery questions would facilitate progress in solving some of the other related questions. The international fishery conservation experience of a number of states has been that solution of some of the less complex parts of the overall problem has made possible progress in solution of the more complex.

It appears highly desirable and fully practical to seek agreement upon principles of international fishery conservation upon the high seas, even though there now are considerable differences among nations regarding the proper extent of the territorial sea. This question is under study by the International Law Commission. In the meantime, under present concepts of the territorial sea, even according to the more extreme versions, there are broad areas of high seas, and there are populations of fish which frequent these areas during all or part of their life cycles. These fish populations support important and growing international fisheries. New techniques for locating and catching fish have greatly increased the efficiency of modern fishing operations and have their effect upon fishery resources. Joint action by nations

concerned is needed to provide for the continued maximum productivity of these resources. Development of and agreement upon adequate and effective principles for the conservation of international fisheries need not and should not be held in abeyance pending settlement of the other issues.

Progress in resolving this question or phases of it, rather than handicapping efforts to reach agreement on related questions, should be helpful. If the United Nations can develop agreement on principles or procedures for safeguarding the continued productivity of high seas fishery resources in such a way as to give proper consideration to the interests of all nations, it may prove less difficult to reconcile differences with regard to the necessary extent of the territorial sea.

If we are first to limit and then to reduce the area of disagreement among friendly nations, which up to now has been widening, concerning the "regime of the high seas," it is essential that we find some area of agreement. We can then labor to expand this area until our differences diminish and, we hope, in time vanish. Conservation may well provide this area of agreement.

Mr. Chairman, a draft resolution, co-sponsored by Belgium, China, France, Greece, Iceland, Netherlands, Panama, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States, has been tabled and is now before the committee.³ This resolution provides for the convening of a conference to deal with problems of conservation and regulation of international high-seas fisheries. We would like to see the proposed conference restrict its attention to the fishery questions dealt with by the International Law Commission and the problems related to the conservation of international fisheries. We would like to see the conference study the principles proposed by the International Law Commission and particularly consider their adequacy and practicability from the technical and administrative standpoint. It is not intended that the conference consider the subject of marketing or other economic matters divorced from conservation. In any event, however, it is evident that exploration of the problems above outlined, by an *ad hoc* conference with appropriate representation of experts, is a necessary prerequisite to any further construc-

tive step which the United Nations may take in this field.

My Government wishes to bring to the attention of this committee and the General Assembly the fact that the Organization of American States is planning to convoke a specialized conference in 1955 for the broad purpose of studying as a whole the different aspects of the juridical and economic system governing the submarine shelf, oceanic waters, and their natural resources, in the light of present-day scientific knowledge. The date for this conference has not yet been determined. Although the purpose of this conference covers matters far outside the subject of the United Nations conference proposed in the draft resolution now before this committee, it is desirable to avoid any conflict in the dates set for the two conferences, since such conflict might provide a handicap to some countries in arranging for representation. My Government therefore suggests that the Secretary-General, in arranging for the proposed conference, consult with appropriate representatives of the Organization of American States for the purpose of setting conference dates which do not conflict, bearing in mind that the United Nations conference is to be convened not later than July 1955.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

U.N. doc. A/Resolution/268

The General Assembly,

Considering that the International Law Commission has proposed for the consideration of the General Assembly draft articles covering certain basic aspects of the international regulation of fisheries, and considering also that that Commission has not yet concluded its study of related questions,

Having regard to the fact that the problem of the international conservation of fisheries involves matters of a technical character which require consideration on a wide international basis by qualified experts,

Being of the opinion that an international technical conference should be held in the near future to consider the problems of fishery conservation and make recommendations thereon,

Recalling that, by resolution 798 (VIII) of 7 December 1953, the General Assembly, having regard to the fact that the problems relating to the high seas, territorial waters, contiguous zones, the continental shelf and the superjacent waters are closely linked together juridically as well as physically, decided, consequently, not to deal with any aspect of those topics until all the problems involved had been studied by the International Law Commission and reported upon by it to the General Assembly,

³ U.N. doc. A/C.6/L.343. The resolution, as amended, was adopted by Committee VI on Dec. 7 by a vote of 41-5 (Soviet bloc)-5 and by the plenary on Dec. 14 by a vote of 38-5-4.

Having regard to the fact that the technical studies relating to the conservation, protection and regulation of fisheries and other resources of the sea are also closely linked to the solution of the problems mentioned in the preceding paragraph,

1. *Requests* the Secretary-General to convene an international technical conference at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on 18 April 1955 to study the problem of the international conservation of the living resources of the sea and to make appropriate scientific and technical recommendations which shall take into account the principles of the present resolution and shall not prejudice the related problems awaiting consideration by the General Assembly;

2. *Invites* all States Members of the United Nations and States members of the specialized agencies to participate in the conference and to include among their representatives individual experts competent in the field of fishery conservation and regulation;

3. *Invites* the interested specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations concerned with problems of the international conservation of the living resources of the sea, to send observers to the conference;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to arrange for the necessary staff and facilities which would be required for the conference, it being understood that the technical services of Governments of Member States and the technical and secretarial services of the Food and Agriculture Organization shall be utilized as fully as practicable in the arrangements for such a conference;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to circulate the report of the conference for information to the Governments of all States invited to participate in the conference;

6. *Decides* to refer the report of the said scientific and technical conference to the International Law Commission as a further technical contribution to be taken into account in its study of the questions to be dealt with in the final report which it is to prepare pursuant to resolution (IX) of 14 December 1954.⁴

Future of Togoland Under U.K. Administration

*Statement by Senator H. Alexander Smith
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly⁵*

At successive sessions of the General Assembly, the United States delegation has followed with deep interest the evolution of the Togoland problem before the United Nations. We have seen the "Ewe question" modulate into the "Togoland unification question," and the emergence of the imminent question of the "Future of the Territory of Togoland under United Kingdom Trusteeship."

⁴ See A/Resolution/267, p. 64.

⁵ Made in Committee IV (Trusteeship) on Dec. 7 (U.S. delegation press release 2064).

Perhaps no one will deny that this development has placed before the General Assembly its most important and complicated problem to date in the trusteeship field.

The fact that the General Assembly is at this time considering the future of the small West African territory known as the Trust Territory of Togoland under United Kingdom administration results both from the rapid political evolution of that section of Africa and from the special responsibilities of the United Nations toward trust territories. More specifically, our consideration of this question derives from the memorandum of the United Kingdom Government of June 21, 1954, and Trusteeship Council Resolution 1002 (XIV). In its memorandum the United Kingdom Government states that the Gold Coast, of which British Togoland has administratively constituted an integral part since World War I, will shortly achieve an independent status. When this occurs, the United Kingdom has indicated that it will be necessary to amend, replace, or terminate the trusteeship agreement for the Territory.

In the 14th meeting of the Trusteeship Council, the United States representative spoke of the importance of the recent developments in West Africa which have resulted in the rapid evolution of the trusteeship problem now before us.⁶ He emphasized the great significance of June 15, 1954, when general elections were held in the Gold Coast and British Togoland under a system of universal adult suffrage. Inasmuch as the peoples of British Togoland had an opportunity to express, by their support for various candidates, their views on questions relating to the future of their territory, these elections were hailed as a step toward an ultimate application of the principle of self-determination. This was the basis for our sponsorship of Trusteeship Council Resolution 1002 (XIV), which took note of the United Kingdom Government's request that the "Future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under United Kingdom Trusteeship" be placed on the provisional agenda of the Ninth General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, the matter before us relates to but a segment of the important political developments which are taking place in West Africa. The Congress of the United States, in a joint resolution approved by the President on August 27, 1954, as Public Law 667, 83d Congress, 2d Session,

⁶ BULLETIN of July 12, 1954, p. 62.

took note of the recent milestones in the progress of peoples in this area toward self-government and independence. The occasion for this joint resolution was to extend the most cordial greetings of the Congress of the United States to the representative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the occasion of the meeting of their legislatures under their revised constitution.

I commend a reading of this resolution by the petitioners who have come here to present various views in regard to the future administration of their territories. They will find in it a statement of "the policy of the United States to encourage efforts toward independence and self-government truly expressive of the desires of the people and as they show their capability to establish and protect free institutions." They will also find implicit in the resolution a sincere and solid basis for the warm welcome and sympathetic consideration for their aspirations which I have the honor to express on behalf of my delegation and my Government.

It is the view of the administering authority that, through integration with an independent Gold Coast, the Trust Territory of Togoland under United Kingdom administration would achieve the objectives of the trusteeship system. They consider, moreover, that such integration is what the majority of British Togolandese desire, and they point to the results of the general elections of last June as a preliminary indication that this interpretation of the inhabitants' wishes is correct. At the same time they appreciate that, as one party to the trusteeship agreement, the General Assembly will wish to form its own opinion as to what status the majority of the inhabitants desire for their territory when the Gold Coast becomes independent.

Determining the wishes of a territory like British Togoland, where acquaintance with modern political institutions is still very new, is not an easy task. This underlines the importance of taking great pains to assure that means are devised whereby the wishes of the people are fully, effectively, and accurately expressed, reflecting a genuine understanding of the issues at stake.

It is for this reason that my delegation finds itself in entire agreement with the resolution introduced by India, which would entrust the initial task of drawing up arrangements for ascertaining the peoples' wishes to the Trusteeship Council. The Council as the United Nations organ devoted particularly to the functioning of the trusteeship

system is in the best position to give this matter the thorough study it warrants and to work out the most effective possible arrangements for final decision by the General Assembly. We agree, too, that the Council should have the benefit of an on-the-spot study of this problem by a visiting mission. We feel sure that with such assistance the Council will be able to present a plan to the next General Assembly that will command wide support and contribute to the effective functioning of the trusteeship system at this historic juncture in its development.⁷

New Status of Greenland

*Statement by A. M. Ade Johnson
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly⁸*

In addressing the committee on the question of cessation of transmission of information concerning Greenland, my delegation wishes to extend a warm welcome to the two honorable Greenland members of the Danish Parliament who have journeyed here to assist us in our deliberations. We trust that the return visit of Mr. Augo Lynge and Mr. Frederik Lynge to the United Nations and to our country will be a rewarding one.

My delegation and my Government wish to record their appreciation for the way in which the Danish Government has complied with General Assembly Resolution 222 (III) which calls for the transmission to the United Nations of information on the constitutional changes which occur and which lead administering members to decide to

⁷ On Dec. 14 the General Assembly, by a vote of 44-0-12, adopted a resolution (A/Res./277) (1) deciding to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants as to their future, (2) requesting the Trusteeship Council to consider arrangements, (3) further requesting the Council to send a special visiting mission to the two Togolands to study the problem, and (4) urging that meanwhile those directly concerned lend their utmost cooperation to earlier recommendations of the Assembly.

⁸ Made in Committee IV (Trusteeship) on Nov. 10 (U.S. delegation press release 2016).

The committee on Nov. 12 adopted by a vote of 34-4-12 a resolution (U.N. doc. A/C.4/L.354), as amended, by which the General Assembly would affirm that Greenland had ceased to be a non-self-governing territory and that Denmark need no longer transmit data on the territory. The Assembly approved the proposal on Nov. 22 by a vote of 45-1 (Belgium)-11.

cease reporting on a particular territory. My Government, as the committee will recall, has had some experience in complying with this resolution⁹ and can, therefore, fully appreciate the background entailed in the preparation and transmittal of documentation such as that contained in the communication from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Denmark to the Secretary-General of September 14, 1953.¹⁰ In this same connection we congratulate the Danish delegation upon the compendium of developments during the years leading up to the constitutional amendment of June 1953.¹¹ This remarkably fine catalog of up-to-date information on Greenland, prepared in accordance with the "standard form," is a most fitting conclusion to the transmission of information on a former non-self-governing territory. At the same time it constitutes a splendid introduction to the land and people of what has become an integral part of the Danish realm. This report, together with the handsome and fascinating volume on Greenland published by the Royal Danish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the statements by the Danish delegation in the Committee on Information and in this committee, sets forth a record of human achievement, advancement, and cooperation which should be heart-warming indeed to the General Assembly.

In the Committee on Information the United States delegation shared the unanimous view that the information before it indicated that Greenland may be considered as falling outside the scope of chapter XI of the charter, and consequently it is no longer necessary or appropriate for the Government of Denmark to transmit information under article 73 (e). At that time the United States delegate stressed the fact that there could be no doubt as to Denmark's good faith or the desire of the people of Greenland to become an integral part of the Danish realm. It has been made clear by the Greenland members of the Danish delegation that the local population has enjoyed full freedom of choice.

On behalf of my Government, I wish to express again the hope that the peoples of Denmark and Greenland will be successful and prosperous as

⁹ For material on the cessation of transmission of information concerning Puerto Rico, see BULLETIN of Feb. 9, 1953, p. 229; Apr. 20, 1953, p. 584; and Dec. 14, 1953, p. 841.

¹⁰ U.N. doc. A/AC.35/L.155.

¹¹ This memorandum is attached as an annex to L. 155.

a single nation and to thank their Government and the Danish delegation for their valuable cooperation with the United Nations. Although Denmark will cease to appear on our rolls as an administering member, we will continue to have the benefit of its delegation's experience and proverbial cooperation here in this committee. Those members of delegations with the longest experience in United Nations work are in the best position to appreciate the tribute due our staunch colleague in this committee, Mr. Hermod Lan-nung, for his dedication to the principles which guide our work, his friendliness, and his long-standing record of helpful collaboration.

Economic and Social Progress in Non-Self-Governing Territories

Statement by C. D. Jackson

U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

Mr. Chairman, in view of your announcement Wednesday that we would consider together all aspects of the item before us, I will comment first on the report on economic conditions.² Thereafter, I would like to report to the Committee on two interesting developments in territories under United States administration. Finally, I wish to make some general comments on the value of the work of the Non-Self-Governing Territories Committee and the Fourth Committee and the general approach of my Government to the problem of dependent territories.

Report on Economic Conditions

We believe that the report on economic developments is a worthy supplement to the report compiled in 1951. As was the case with respect to the earlier report, the Committee's task was facilitated by the analyses of special economic problems in non-self-governing territories prepared by the Secretariat. In this connection my delegation found the paper entitled "Enlargement of the Exchange Economy in Tropical Africa"³ to be of particular value. Administering members too

¹ Made in Committee IV (Trusteeship) on Oct. 25 (U.S. delegation press release 1989).

² U.N. doc. A/2729.

³ U.N. doc. E/2557.

are to be congratulated for the quantity and quality of the information they are transmitting. The value of the information transmitted transcends our limited purposes in the Committee and here in the Fourth Committee. I am sure that all administering authorities are aware of the importance of maintaining reliable and up-to-date statistical services in their territories so that available information on them will be as complete as possible. Developments in the private sector of the economies is one area in which my delegation believes we could usefully get more complete information.

Turning to the substance of the Committee's report,¹ we note the emphasis which is given to popular participation in the economic development of territories as part of a fundamental philosophy affecting the whole range of developments in non-self-governing territories and the relationship between administrations and peoples. We attach great importance to the closest possible participation of the indigenous inhabitants of non-self-governing territories in the process of planning and executing economic development programs. There are few things which will promote the capacity of a people for self-government faster than the assumption of direct responsibility for the formulation and execution of their own development programs. In many territories the responsibility assumed by the local peoples is almost complete. In others it is still confined to an advisory role. My delegation is gratified by the progress that has been made in this field and would encourage the administering authorities to pursue this line of development.

One of the most basic problems of development in underdeveloped areas is that of financing development programs. The information available indicates that administering authorities have tried in varying degrees and with varying success to mobilize local capital for this purpose. Although such capital is not always readily available in non-self-governing territories in sufficient quantities, successful efforts to mobilize it can increase the sense of participation in development as well as providing a stake in the future of the territory for the inhabitants. In this connection I would like to reaffirm the interest of the United States in expanding the investment of international private capital in underdeveloped areas. In so doing it is not my intention to minimize the need for public investment in the development of basic facilities

or for the mobilization of local capital investment. The potentialities for development from the investment of international private capital are such that it will be well worthwhile for countries to make genuine efforts not only to remove the more obvious impediments to the flow of private capital but also to attempt to create the necessary favorable climate to attract it.

My delegation believes that it is particularly noteworthy that at the 1954 session of the Committee on Information six members included specialist advisers on economic affairs on their delegations. These specialists made a solid contribution to the Committee's report, and it is hoped that at future sessions the Committee will have the benefit of such technical advice. The U.S. delegation has consistently taken the view that the Committee on Information provides an excellent forum through which members have an opportunity to exchange views on problems which in many respects are universal and not particular to a limited number of territories. The opportunity provided by the Committee for both administering and non-administering members to exchange their views and experiences in dealing with similar problems can be of great value and can ultimately contribute to the welfare of non-self-governing peoples.

We would urge the General Assembly to approve the Committee's economic report in its general terms and bring it to the attention of specialized agencies and other organizations interested in the economic advancement of non-self-governing peoples and recommend it for the consideration of the administering members.

Turning now to the social and educational fields, I would like to share with the Committee information on two recent developments in U.S. territories because they may be a source of inspiration and practical value to other peoples.

Virgin Islands Program

Members of this Committee are well aware of the need for developing opportunities for higher education in dependent territories and the tremendous efforts which are required to even begin to meet this problem. In many small or highly underdeveloped territories an institution of higher education often seems to be a remote possibility. For this reason the recent development of the Virgin Islands program for improvement of teaching we believe is significant.

This program is the result of the initial efforts of Dr. Alonzo G. Moron, a native of the Virgin Islands who is now the President of a well-known American institution of higher education, the Hampton Institute in Virginia. Dr. Moron has remained deeply concerned with the problems of the Virgin Islands. Through his efforts and the cooperation of the Ford Foundation, there has been established in the islands the Hampton Institute-Ford Foundation program for the improvement of teaching in the Virgin Islands. The Committee may be interested in a brief report on this program.

Aided by a grant of \$247,200 from the fund for the advancement of education, Hampton Institute has embarked on a twofold program for the improvement of the quality of teaching in the Virgin Islands. The need for such a program arises mainly from the fact that there is no institution of higher learning on the Virgin Islands, and the educational system there has had to recruit teaching staff from graduates of the local high schools. Of the 180 teachers in the system, approximately 80 percent have had no training beyond high school.

Beginning October 1, 1953, Hampton Institute sent two members of its faculty to give in-service courses to teachers in the Virgin Islands. These two teachers conducted classes for the Virgin Islands' teachers on the Island of St. Croix during the first semester and the Island of St. Thomas during the second semester. Eighty-five percent of all the public school teachers who are not college graduates were enrolled in these courses. This in-service program was continued during the summer of 1954 with the establishment of session I of the Experimental College for the Virgin Islands at St. Thomas. To conduct courses during an intensive 5-week session, Hampton Institute sent four distinguished professors from Hampton and other colleges to conduct courses in English, mathematics, American history, and sociology. Ninety-eight teachers from the three islands were enrolled in these courses and enjoyed the experience of attending a "college" in the Virgin Islands. For these 5 weeks a hotel was rented to house the teachers from St. Croix and St. John and the off-island faculty. Classes, lectures and recreation activities were all held at the hotel site.

The second aspect of this program for the improvement of the quality of teaching in the Virgin Islands involves the granting of all-expense scholarships to a select group of 10 high school

students from the Virgin Islands to enable them to matriculate at Hampton in a special teacher-training course. Recognizing the opportunities for experimentation, the college has designed a 5-year course of which the first 4 years will be devoted to the study of liberal arts subjects with a fifth year of practice teaching, seminars, and educational methods. Also participating in this special program will be a select group of 10 scholarship students from the continental United States. This particular type of training was chosen for this group in an attempt to prepare teachers whose training would be broad enough to enable them to provide leadership in the community at the same time they were doing good work in the school system.

The local government has given excellent cooperation to Hampton Institute and to the fund for the advancement of education in this joint endeavor. Since the grant was made to the college instead of the Government of the Virgin Islands, the program has proceeded without interruption from recent changes in the local administration.

The program will continue in 1954-55 with another team of teachers being sent to the Islands for the winter and spring sessions. Session II of the Experimental College will be conducted in St. Croix in the summer of 1955.

As national chairman of the United Negro College Fund, the development of this type of program at Hampton Institute is particularly gratifying to me.

Foreign Aid Trainee Program in Hawaii

The second development I should like to mention relates to the Territory of Hawaii. The multiracial population of the territory is made up of Hawaiian, part Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, Chinese, Japanese, Caucasian, Korean, Filipino, and other races. The Caucasian percentage of the total population is only 15.3 percent. We believe that Hawaii presents to people on the American mainland as well as those from abroad an inspiring example of how peoples of different ethnic origins can learn to live and work happily together; of how social understanding can be enhanced as social prejudices are removed. In this respect we believe that Hawaii has a significant contribution to make to international understanding because of the nearness of its people in culture, thought, and ancestry to peoples of many other countries.

Desiring to play a part in the promotion of international understanding as an essential for securing future world peace, the territory itself has launched what we believe to be a very sound investment in the great cause for which the United Nations was established. Its Governor, the Honorable Samuel Wilder King, has recently appointed a Foreign Aid Trainee Program Committee under the chairmanship of the President of the University of Hawaii. The membership of this Committee is representative of the Government of Hawaii, the University of Hawaii, and the entire business community.

Although this Committee has been in existence less than a year, its accomplishments to date and its planning for the future are encouraging. The broad aims of the Committee are to bring about the establishment in the free social climate of Hawaii a training center for American students and technicians going out to the Far East, Asia, and the Pacific Islands and for students and other visitors coming from these areas to the American mainland.

Already a short orientation program for students coming to America has been established. While students are studying our language and being briefed on such matters as United States customs, money, transportation, foods, living conditions, etc., they shall have the opportunity to visit territorial and municipal offices, court sessions, trade union headquarters, sugar plantations, canning factories, and city and farm homes. The Committee is working toward the establishment of long-term training and observation programs utilizing the excellent training facilities available in the fields of health, education, agriculture, including agricultural extension and plantation health and management, public administration, business and vocational education.

In the 4-month period from June through September, the International Cooperation Center served 305 individuals from 18 countries who altogether spent 1,590 man-days in Hawaii under the auspices of the center.

The idea that Hawaii would be an excellent place for training Americans to go abroad and people from other countries coming to the United States is not a new one. However, this idea did not get translated into a coordinated program until the people in Hawaii organized themselves for the purpose of increasing their capacity to promote cooperation and understanding in the

field of international relations. In launching their training center, they drew heavily upon the experience and methods utilized in Puerto Rico in the successful establishment and development of training programs in that island. The program in Hawaii is managed locally: its director, Dr. Y. Baron Goto, is of Japanese origin; its deputy director is of Chinese origin; while its secretary is Caucasian.

Mr. Chairman, I have invited attention to these two developments as examples of the type of activities being carried on in many countries. Knowledge of worthwhile action of this sort should become increasingly widespread. Here in this Committee and in the Committee on Information there is a very real opportunity to exchange information and to gain an appreciation of constructive developments which are taking place in many countries. Such developments demonstrate the important principles of cooperation and good-neighborliness set forth in article 73 (d) and article 74 of the charter which should be fundamental guides for our work here.

Work of Committee IV

I feel that this conclusion of what might be called the "business" portion of my remarks, without an additional thought or two concerning the work and responsibilities and "mood" of this Committee, would not fully convey my feelings to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of the Committee. It is possible that I am motivated to do this by the fact that I am a newcomer and therefore somewhat more impressionable than some of you who have been through it all before. But, as a newcomer, I could not help reflecting over the past weeks about this Committee and its work.

I suppose that the thing that struck me with greatest force was the simple fact that this Committee exists. I am impressed by the fact that representatives of 60 nations should gather here to discuss the problems of the 200 million people who live in colonial or non-self-governing territories, many of them in remote areas and probably quite unaware that they are the subjects of international discussion. It seems to me that in the sweep of history it is still a new, even a revolutionary concept, that the fate of peoples "not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world," as the League Covenant put it, should be the concern of the international community.

That there are differences of view, sometimes sharp differences, as to how these people should be assisted to play their full role in the world, is not surprising; in fact it seems to me normal and healthy. Nor does it in any way detract from the importance of this Committee that its functions are limited to discussion, exchange of views, and, where appropriate, the formulation of recommendations. As a person who has devoted more than two decades to the study of public opinion and the dissemination of information, I would be the last to underestimate the power of ideas. I am well aware, too, that when the ideas are infused with emotion they often impel people to action. But when that emotion reaches a certain intensity, the resulting action may be hasty and ill-considered—even violent.

One of the dominant ideas in the contemporary world is the idea of "nationalism." This concept is, moreover, heavily loaded with emotion. In this fact lie both the virtue and the danger in this Committee's discussions. Negatively speaking, the virtue lies in the fact that discussion, even intemperate discussion, is better than intemperate action. Moreover, discussion serves to bring out the complexities of some of these problems and correct somewhat the tendency we all have to oversimplify and to be doctrinaire as to their solution.

The danger lies in the possibility that the intensity with which some delegations push for the acceptance of their convictions may threaten the essential cooperation of those members on whom devolve the practical problems of bringing about the desired progress.

The payoff, to use an American colloquialism, does not belong to the most vehement nation but to the nation able to do something about it—namely, the administering authority. Now it is not enough just to be able. That nation must also be willing. And therein lies the subtlety inherent in the debates of this particular Committee. If the heat of the debate impairs the willingness, there is no longer any influence on the ability.

These thoughts, and the plea for moderation in our discussion that is implicit in them, will not be new to you. However, I feel that they are worth restating at this time, particularly as they represent a basic element in my Government's approach to colonial questions. As Secretary of State Dulles expressed it, where we exercise restraint

it is because of a reasoned conviction that precipitate action would in fact not produce independence "but only transition to a captivity far worse than present dependence." At the same time he went on to emphasize "our conviction that orderly transition from colonial to self-governing status should be carried resolutely to completion."

It is not necessary to dwell here on the fact that orderly transition to genuine and lasting self-government or independence means that solid economic, social, and educational foundations must be built. While the international community has a legitimate concern that the need for sound foundations not be used as an excuse to delay political progress, it is obvious that the responsibility for building these foundations rests almost entirely with the administering powers in cooperation with the colonial peoples themselves. The contribution of the international community is largely in terms of ideas and attitudes. It is in this field that my delegation feels that the Non-Self-Governing Territories Committee and this Committee can make their most valuable contribution.

I think it is useful at this point to state what I believe to be a fact of contemporary political life: In the free world the trend toward increasing self-government is a genuine, accelerating trend. In the free world the direction of the flywheel of colonialism has not only been arrested—it has been reversed.

Given this fact, what should our attitude be?

Certainly not complacency. Some who may not feel that the flywheel is turning in its new direction with sufficient speed obviously have the right to express impatience. But I wonder if it would be a wise course to allow impatience to become indignation. As I said, we do not have to stop the flywheel; we don't even have to start it going the other way—it is already moving in the proper direction in the free world. There may be other and more appropriate subjects for indignation.

That is the sum of my somewhat philosophical reflections, which I hope you will not take amiss from a newcomer.

We will listen with the greatest interest to the views of other members, and we hope that when this session has concluded, we will have been drawn together by the objectives we share more than divided by our differences as to the methods.

Illustrative of what I am trying to say in

measured language occurred in somewhat less measured language last Friday [October 22]. In speeches we heard here on Friday some rather strong language was used regarding the administering authorities, including a reference to the European nations as "hypocritical" in their attitude toward non-self-governing territories.

If such a statement can be made in this Committee in reference to nations which have demonstrated actual, visible, tangible forward movement toward decolonialization, may I redress some of the balance by suggesting that some notice, no matter how cursory, be taken of the new colonialism which is rising in the Soviet orbit. We ought to consider whether there isn't more than one kettle we wish to call black, or, to put it another way, which particular one merits our indignation.

In the eyes of the world the success of our work will not be judged by the extent to which any one of our viewpoints has prevailed. It will be judged by the extent to which it has actually advanced the dependent peoples along the road to stable and secure self-government or independence—a goal that will not be advanced by disunity in the free world.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Genocide

Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Done at Paris December 9, 1948.¹
Ratification deposited: Greece, December 8, 1954.

North Atlantic Treaty

Agreement on the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, national representatives and international staff. Opened for signature at Ottawa September 20, 1951. Entered into force May 18, 1954. TIAS 2992.
Ratification deposited: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, December 10, 1954.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force January 1, 1954.¹

¹ Not in force for the United States.

Associate Membership approved (United Kingdom application) for: Bermuda-British Caribbean Group (including Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla, and British Virgin Islands), Trinidad and Tobago, and Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), November 28, 1954.

BILATERAL

Brazil

Agreement amending and extending naval mission agreement of 1942 (EAS 247) as amended (TIAS 1559). Effected by exchange of notes at Rio de Janeiro June 29 and October 9, 1954. Entered into force October 9, 1954.

Denmark

Arrangement providing for certificates of airworthiness for imported aircraft. Effected by exchange of notes at Copenhagen December 15, 1954. Entered into force December 15, 1954.

Arrangement providing for reciprocal recognition of certificates of airworthiness for imported aircraft. Effected by exchange of notes at Copenhagen March 12 and 24, 1954 (EAS 60).

Terminated: December 15, 1954.

Greece

Agreement approving signature sheet to be added to model contract attached to agreement of July 30, 1954 (TIAS 3034) concerning the basic principles and policies governing the offshore procurement program in Greece. Effected by exchange of notes at Athens October 14 and November 12, 1954. Entered into force November 12, 1954.

Mexico

Agreement providing for non-occupational insurance for injuries and illnesses for Mexican workers, pursuant to agreement of March 10, 1954 (TIAS 2932). Effected by exchange of notes at Mexico November 19, 1954. Entered into force November 19, 1954.

THE DEPARTMENT

Appointment

Edward Corsi as Special Assistant to the Secretary for Refugee and Migration Problems, effective January 10 (press release 736 dated December 30).

Designation

Julius C. Holmes as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, effective December 20.

American Principles. Balancing the Books for 1954 (Dulles)	43
Cambodia. Direct Defense Support for Laos, Cambodia, and Viet-Nam	51
Denmark. New Status of Greenland (Johnson)	68
Economic Affairs	
The American Farmer and Foreign Trade (Thibodeaux)	45
U.S. Delegation to Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East	57
Procedures for Administering Buy American Act (text of Executive order)	50
Rejection of Higher Duties on Screen-Printed Silk Scarves (Eisenhower)	52
Schedule of Fees on Munitions Shipments Not in Force Until April	51
U.N. To Convene Conference on Fishery Conservation (statement and text of resolution)	64
France. Vote by French Assembly on London and Paris Accords (Dulles)	43
Greenland. New Status of Greenland (Johnson)	68
International Information. Freedom of Information as a Weapon for Peace (Johnson)	58
International Organizations and Meetings	
Preservation of International Metric Standards (Crittenden)	54
U.S. Delegation to Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East	57
Laos. Direct Defense Support for Laos, Cambodia, and Viet-Nam	51
Military Affairs. U.S. and U.K. Discuss Extension of Prov- ing Ground for Guided Missiles	44
Mutual Security	
Direct Defense Support for Laos, Cambodia, and Viet-Nam	51
Vote by French Assembly on London and Paris Accords (Dulles)	43
Non-Self-Governing Territories	
Economic and Social Progress in Non-Self-Governing Ter- ritories (Jackson)	69
Future of Togoland Under U.K. Administration (Smith)	67
Presidential Documents	
Procedures for Administering Buy American Act	50
Rejection of Higher Duties on Screen-Printed Silk Scarves	52
State, Department of	
Appointment (Corsi)	74
Designation (Holmes)	74
Togoland. Future of Togoland Under U.K. Administration (Smith)	67
Treaty Information. Current Actions	74
U.S.S.R. Return of Lend-Lease Vessels	52
United Kingdom. U.S. and U.K. Discuss Extension of Proving Ground for Guided Missiles	44
United Nations	
Economic and Social Progress in Non-Self-Governing Ter- ritories (Jackson)	69
Freedom of Information as a Weapon for Peace (John- son)	58

Future of Togoland Under U.K. Administration (Smith)	67
Law Commission Asked To Submit Final Report on High Seas Problems (statement and text of resolution)	62
New Status of Greenland (Johnson)	68
U.N. To Convene Conference on Fishery Conservation (statement and text of resolution)	64
Viet-Nam. Direct Defense Support for Laos, Cambodia, and Viet-Nam	51

Name Index

Corsi, Edward	74
Crittenden, E. C.	54
Dulles, Secretary	43
Eisenhower, President	50, 52
Holmes, Julius C.	74
Jackson, C. D.	69
Johnson, A. M. Ade	58, 68
Mahoney, Charles H.	62
Nash, James P.	64
Smith, H. Alexander	67
Thibodeaux, Ben H.	45

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: December 27-January 2

Releases may be obtained from the News Division,
Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press release issued prior to December 27 which
appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 729 of
December 23.

No.	Date	Subject
*730	12/28	Educational exchange.
*731	12/28	Educational exchange.
*732	12/28	Lodge and Dunn nominations; Kem- per resignation.
733	12/30	Extension of proving ground in Atlantic.
734	12/30	Delegation to ECAFE.
735	12/30	Effective date of munitions licensing fees.
736	12/30	Corsi appointment (rewrite).
737	12/30	Dulles: French vote on WEU.
†738	12/30	Air transport agreement with Venezuela.
739	12/31	Defense support for Indochina.
*740	12/31	Educational exchange.
741	12/31	Dulles: year-end review.

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)



the
Department
of
State

How Foreign Policy Is Made

Publication 5585

15 cents

Who makes our foreign policy and how is it made? Who decides what the Nation shall do in its relations with the rest of the world and how are decisions reached?

For the answers to these questions, read *How Foreign Policy Is Made*. This short, illustrated pamphlet describes briefly and directly

- . . . the role of the President
- . . . of Congress
- . . . of the official household
- . . . the composition and task of the National Security Council
- . . . the functions and organization of the Department of State
- . . . the effect other nations may have on our policymaking
- . . . the basic part played by our citizenry in determining foreign policy decisions

Copies of *How Foreign Policy Is Made* may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Order Form

to: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me _____ copies of *How Foreign Policy Is Made*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

